DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 127 664 95 EA 008 576

AUTHOR	Rensenbrink, John
TITLE	How Change Does and Does Not Take Place: Innovation and Recurrence in Educational Reform Programs. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Bowdoin Coll., Brunswick, Maine.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.; Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
BUREAU NO	2A039
PUB DATE	30 Jun 76
CONTRACT	OEC-1-72-0007(509)
NOTE	348p.; Not available in hard copy due to small print of original document
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Case Studies (Education); *Educational Change; Educational Innovation; *Elementary Education; Freedom Schools; *Organizational Change; *Program Development; Questionnaires
IDENTIFIERS	Maine

ABSTRACT

This report describes a study that examined the process of educational reform and sought to determine how and why internal changes occur in the evolution of an educational program. The author studied the progress of four educational reforms in the Brunswick-Freeport area of midcoast Maine, including the introduction of significant changes in the Freeport elementary schools from 1969-74, the introduction of a large open-structured elementary school in Brunswick from 1970-74, the founding and implementation of a private free school in Freeport from 1969-74, and the establishment and implementation of an Upward Bound project at Bowdoin College from 1966-73. Part 1 of the report establishes the framework and scientific basis for the study. Part 2 identifies and discusses the basic factors that interact in the change process and traces the history of the four educational reform programs. Part 3 presents the author's conclusions, including findings relevant to the specific hypotheses identified at the start of the study and some general findings that evolved during the course of the study. The appendix contains a copy of the questionnaire used in the study and a list of people interviewed during the study. (Author/JG)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

HOW CHANGE DOES AND DOES NOT TAKE PLACE: INNOVATION AND RECURRENCE IN EDUCATIONAL REFORM PROGRAMS

ED127664

BY JOHN RENSENBRINK

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EA 008 576

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH.
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HOW CHANGE DOES AND DOES NOT TAKE PLACE: INNOVATION AND RECURRENCE IN EDUCATIONAL REFORM PROGRAMS

A Final Report to the Office of Education,
June 30, 1976.

This study was begun in the spring of 1972 and concluded in the summer of 1975. It has been partly funded by a grant from the United States Office of Education. The title of the Research Project, as funded by OE, was "The Process of Effecting Change: How Aims Work out in Practice in Four Change Programs in Education in Mid-Coast Maine." (Vendor Number OE 002038; NIH-601283; Grant Number OEC-1-72-0007 (509); Transaction Number 720E 8374; Project Number 2A039.) Up to October 1972, the project's sponsoring officer in OE was Dr. Richard V. McCann, Office of Education, Region I, JFK Building, Boston, Massachusetts. Thereafter it has been Dr. Ron Anson, Project Officer, Office of Research Grants, National Institute of Education, Washington, D. C. The cooperating sponsoring institution was Bowdoin College. The project director was John Rensenbrink, Professor of Government and Legal Studies, Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Maine 04011.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

To the 150 teachers, students, parents,
school administrators, school board
members, town officials and others who
gave their time and energy for interviews,
I dedicate this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface 1

PART I.: The Basis of the Study

Ch. 1 The Original Plan of the Study Page 1
Ch. 2 Search of the Related Research Page 8
Ch. 3 Concept Development and Modification Page 20
Ch. 4 Modification of the Four Original Hypotheses Page 34
Ch. 5 The Discovery of Factors Interacting in the Process of Change Page 37
Ch. 6 Epistemological Approach, Research Anatomy and Research Strategy Page 40
Ch. 7 The Political and the Educational: Demarcation and Relationship Page 55

PART II.: Nine Sets of Factors That Interact in the Process of Change

Ch. 1 Dualities-in-Conflict, or Cultural Discontinuity Page 70
Ch. 2 Rebellion or the Roots of Consciousness: Defiance, Emulation, and New Values Page 87
Ch. 3 Belief Styles Page 112
Ch. 4 The Manner of Commitment Page 126
Ch. 5 Consciousness Page 133
Ch. 6 The Dual Face of Compromise Page 146
Ch. 7 Strategy Page 159

TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont.)

Ch. 8 Patterns of Organization Page 177

Ch. 9 Styles of Leadership Page 197

PART III: Conclusions Page 211

APPENDIX A: Questionnaire and Profiles by Mark Terison Page 253

APPENDIX B: List of people interviewed Page 323

Preface

The Freeport Public School System in mid-coast Maine experienced a series of events in 1969/1970 which led to pronounced changes. The tide of change swept over the primary schools, partly inundated the middle school and lapped at the edges of the High School. The wave of change receded, affecting the Middle School very little, the High School even less. But it left in its wake an elementary system which from being one of the worst in the state has come to be regarded as one of the best.

Starting already in the late sixties, there was planning afoot for a new, innovative primary school in Brunswick, a neighboring town. These plans deepened, and expectations were high when at last the building was completed and a new elementary school (K-5) "without walls" opened in the fall of 1972. Yet the impact on the rest of the system has been modest if not minimal and the new school itself, far from realizing the intent of the original rhetoric, has largely adapted itself, or been adapted, to the administrative and/pedagogical norms of the prevailing system.

The Upward Bound Program at Bowdoin College in Brunswick, from its inception in 1966, has had the triple goal of (a) helping a selected number of poor teenage kids from Maine's poorest counties to overcome their disadvantages and learn to "make it" in a middle class world; (b) helping these teenagers develop a greater sense of self and of values consistent with the ideals of equality and a just social order; and (c) affecting for the better wherever possible the social and educational environment from which these teenagers came. The first goal has consistently been accomplished, the second much less so, and third almost not at all.

Collins Brook School, near Freeport, opened in 1969 as a new, free school both for day kids in the neighboring communities and for boarding kids from out of state. Begun with much idealism about the possibilities of freedom-to-learn and freedom-in-learning, the school faced and barely managed to weather successive crises: personal, financial, and ideological. It evolved a structure which was both consistent and not consistent with the original intent. One of the few free schools in Maine (of which there were many) to survive for this long, Collins Brook School, as of the spring of 1976, faces tough choices and difficult realities. If it can survive, it offers a structure and way of life which can be a genuine alternative to prevailing patterns of education.

How and why do these "internal" changes in the evolution of a program take place? That is the guiding question of this inquiry. Part One establishes the scientific basis for the inquiry. Part Two identifies and develops basic factors that interact in the process of change; and carries forward the history of the four educational reform programs under review. Part Three contains the conclusions of the inquiry, both the specific hypotheses which I was concerned to verify at the outset of the research, and the more general findings which evolved out of the process of the inquiry itself.

In the remainder of the preface I describe several dimensions of this inquiry which interact to form a "philosophic core" of my approach to social reality. I did not have this approach when I began the study, though many pieces of it were there; instead it grew out of the process of doing the study. The several dimensions are the concepts of action and growth; the dialectics of rebellion; and the concept of structure.

First, this is a study of action. I examine how people strive consciously to intervene in the flow of activity, both within and without established institutions, in order to accomplish a change in direction.

The area chosen to examine action is education. As I indicate in the first chapter this is partly the result of my experience in educational development both in Africa and in this country. I sense however a deeper, theoretical connection. Education, of all human activities, seems most to aim at growth--and I attribute to action the manifestation of a general human passion, and need, to grow. By growth I understand not only the expansion of knowledge about things, but equally an expansion of the human power to know, to learn, to gain new opportunities, and to experience a greater realization of the self--however minimally or "materially" that self-realization is expressed. The attempted expansion in that kind of human power is a major element in movements for educational change, though it may well be near the core of movements for change in general.

Action contains a strong element that is closely linked to the passion for growth. Action is the deed, however minute or grand; however short or protracted in its complexity and duration; however particular or universal in its scope. Our language confuses us however if we only understand by the deed a thing that happened, or a "dead" event, or a piece of behavior having external dimensions and consequences only. A deed is not like an atom--or what an atom was once thought to be before it was "split." Like the atom, so too the deed needs to be split. The deed, the many connected deeds comprising an event, and the severality of events that define a direction and evolve an enduring structure: these all must be examined in their character as lived states of social being and social interaction. Their character as deeds must be preserved, yet the how of human exchange and inter-change must become the focus of attention. Or say that we need to examine the what of that which is striven for as it becomes translated in and through the how. We need to shine the searchlight of our investigations in such a way that we illumine how the what alters its scope and character in the process of translation.

Though action manifests the struggle for expansion and growth, it is and remains problematic. It is life as lived through conscious beings encountering the "material" of existence and through the encounter seeking to surpass itself. Falling back and "failure" is part of the risks of the encounter.

If, as has been said, a study of action finds ready material in the world of education because of the latter's basic concern for growth; similarly, a study of action is more likely to find ready material in movements or programs for change. In situations of change there is overt intervention. The surface of things is churned up, as in a storm.

In such situations, the dynamics of human interaction, which usually transpire beneath the surface in the normal ongoing flow of activity, tend to be more exposed to view. Action in situations of change therefore is easier to study, easier to get at.

A study of this kind has both a practical and a theoretical intention. By focusing on the how of change, it hopes to clarify the factors in-real-life that need to be understood by the practitioner. But by focusing on change as the problem of action it draws attention to action as itself a category of human experience yielding knowledge of the human condition.

Contrary to what might be expected, studies of action are not plentiful. Studies are copious on the motivation of leaders (and followers); on ideology; on communications; on images of a new society and on intentional communities; on people's responses to issues churned up in situations of change; on the results of change; and (though to a lesser degree) on the historical stages of development of a movement for change, whether evolutionary or revolutionary.

But neither social science hitherto, nor an earlier political economy, nor yet political philosophy in its long history of explorations, has paid much serious scientific attention to the dynamics of human action. This may in good part be ascribed to two contrary responses to life (and thus to nature and to conscious activity in history) which have deeply affected the structure of human culture and the kind of science that is carried on. These two responses are, first, the tendency to stand in awe and fear of nature and history, and thus to depreciate the validity of conscious human intervention; and second, a tendency to rebel against this posture and to affirm man's need and right, to dominate nature and to create himself through history in accordance with his own purposes. The first finds typical expression in certain kinds of religious withdrawal--the myth of "heaven's my destination--I will by faith pass through this veil of tears." The second, partly a secular reaction to this, may be called the Baconian myth--it seeks to organize and even force the material of the world into fully planned, pre-calculated patterns and structures. The first tends to retreat from action. Or, responding to it romantically, it worships action in the form of heroic biography, as for example, in the "lives of great men," a type of literature that, though interesting, is a haloed caricature of the nature of human deeds. The second effaces action altogether. Action is replaced by the aspiration for harmonious, controlled behavior. The formulas that are applied often try to use, as it were against themselves--after the fashion of Hobbes--the perceived antinomies of the human condition in order to effectuate perfect harmony. The paradigm of the capitalist market is a leading case in point.

One is offered by these two orientations, or myths, the unhappy choice of transworldly ethics together with irrational gut heroics; or intense, one-dimensional rationalism.

Meanwhile, however, life goes on and, though beleaguered and eroded by both of these myths, it continues unabated to reveal the complexities, vitalities, richness and contradictions of human beings in action in the world as it is.

Hegel may have been the first thinker with theoretical and speculative power to have posed, or exposed, the need to account for the phenomena of action. He startled and vexed both the agnostic rationalists and Christians of his day by challenging them, not only to explain why evil exists, but to explain why it was so that evil intentions and activity often result in good, and why good intentions and activity so often result in bad. He did not pose this in the "ironical" style, but as a philosopher seriously engaged in the effort to account for the baffling dimensions of action. His attempt to show the gradual immanentization of the spirit (or the self-realization of matter) through the processes of world history in which men act out "what is in them" seems to me too mystical, even mystifying. Yet it does open up for sober scrutiny depths of social reality that preserve intact the relations of inner and outer, while permitting careful inspection of how these relations shift and swerve in the historical flow of events. In this sense Hegel encouraged us to approach action as a process to be monitored carefully. He laid the basis for a dynamic social science--one willing to encounter action as pertaining to objects who are also subjects and to do it with that rare combination of wonder and curiosity that is the touchstone of real science. Marx continued in that spirit--and de-mystified much of Hegel--seeking a way to understand and comprehend the world in its structure as actually lived. Unfortunately, the political outcry against his teachings caused this fundamental element in his philosophy to be lost to view, both by his friends and his foes. They tended to dogmatize his conclusions and largely ignored his method.

Only in the last few decades has there been a renaissance in the study and application of Marx--both in the sense of a recovery of his method and in the increasing emphasis on what is termed praxis, or the self-aware re-application to one's practice of what was learned (reflected upon) in earlier practice. This strongly suggests the feedback factor in action which runs as a major theme through the present study. In this sense, ideas are treated as having material force--or actually it is the category of consciousness that is seen as mediating the contradictions in practice and through struggle resolving or overcoming them. The teachings of Mao-tse-tung are very much along this line. From a different vantage point the Catholic priest Paulo Freire develops a similar approach. His concept of conscience-ization emphasizes the element of growth through action seen as the activation of one's reflection upon one's experience--especially the experience of lived alienation.

From a still different perspective, and some decades earlier, John Dewey, in his much misunderstood concept of "learning by doing," was articulating an understanding of practice not unlike that argued for in the present study and showing marked kinship to those noted above. The work he did in concert with Arthur Bentley on the epistemological foundations of "learning by doing," and his political works emphasizing the intimate connection between democracy and planning (where continuous planning is strongly counterposed to a Baconian type of emphasis on plans)--these works were read and re-read avidly by me in the early stages of my project.

In the later stages, I came upon the works of Merleau Ponty who gave me further reason to believe I was on the right track. His formulation of what it means to know, strongly emphasizes the integrity of the object studied as also a subject--i.e., a being understood in its existence as an acting substance. Furthermore, his conception of human action occurring in and through networks of lived relationships, identified as structures, confirmed what I was discovering from my own research.

So that I sense the scholarship and research on action to be on the upswing. We are coming out from under the hegemony of long standing myths. The irrational retreat from action, the correlative romanticizing of action, and the rationalistic effacement of action are on their way to being transcended.

Second, this is a study of rebellion. As I was doing the field research it became clear to me that the roots of the striving for change, and for growth, were to be found in a double-edged rebellion against existing structures and authority models, or symbols of mastery. This rebellion I found could lead the rebel from defiance of the system or of the master to an emulation of the patterns of the system and the ways of the master. Or--and this is the other edge of rebellion--it could lead the rebel from defiance to the affirmation of a new value (transcending the old patterns) and including action that steadily and progressively embodied that new value in lived social relations. Here was a dialectics at work, a dialectics of rebellion.

There was need to explicate the factors affecting the movement towards emulation or towards transcendance: the degree of polarization of forces in the situation, the nature of beliefs held by the protagonists, the manner in which they held them, the strategy employed, the kind of compromises being struck, the form of organization, the style of leadership, and the degree of consciousness, especially in the leaders. This is elaborated in Part Two of the present study.

In this the self-revealing nuances and feedback of action began to stand out--one road carrying the actors on to deeds that tended to contain or constrict the original impetus for growth; the other road carrying the actors to deeds that tended to enhance the possibilities of growth.

Third, this is a study of structure. It became clear to me that life expresses itself in structure--that every act or deed elaborates a structural exchange, a response to a relationship or set of relationships, or simply a positing of a relational meaning to which a response is expected. Structure is thus a set of actually lived relationships having form, having pulsation (a process of continuing feedback) and having meaning or (usually) multiple meanings.

Therefore, rebellion, however modest, is inevitably a powerful eruption. It jars a structure throughout. One is not dealing with a collection of more or less self-contained atoms or monads, each of which "enters into" relations with everyone else, thus making up a network for which the word organization or institution might suffice. On the contrary, one is dealing with a highly charged and intimately interconnected set of relationships and multiple ongoing feedback responses and reverberations. Set a motion going, an interventionist type of motion, in a given direction, and the responses are legion. They soon reverberate back again on the intervenor.

Structures self-protect themselves instinctively and either expel or contain the new element. That is one proposition. The other is that unless the change one seeks to accomplish changes the structure there is no, or very little change--no matter how much external drama there may be and no matter how many players change position. Rebellion is swallowed up in individual performances, leaving only a ripple behind--this happens, that is, unless the deeds that are done translate the inspiration and belief into actual lived relationships, including their form, their informal processes, and their meaning to the people involved.

The consciousness that this is what is at stake and the further consciousness that change is effectuated through action (and not either through perfect plans or gut heroics)--such consciousness may be a major factor tilting the movement for change in the direction of growth. Yet it may also be said that consciousness is only born through action.

We encounter here a contradiction: without action, no consciousness; without consciousness, no action. We need a middle term. Perhaps that middle term is rebellion. Life itself provides the rebel--and in the rebel there is the dawn of consciousness. The rebel experiences the need to act. Greater knowledge of the nature of action may serve to bring that dawning consciousness to a clearer and fuller expression, which when "added in" to the experience of action, may create a more persistent movement towards growth and a more civilized transformation of structures than has hitherto characterized the behavior of the species.

Acknowledgements. I am grateful to the U. S. Office of Education for a substantial grant that enabled me to launch this project in 1972. I also wish to thank Bowdoin College for a sabbatical which gave me full time for a year and a half in which to do the field research; for the many services provided to me throughout the three years of the project; and for a small research grant that helped me to hire part-time research assistants. Special acknowledgement is due to Mrs. Gladys E. Peterson of Bowdoinham, Maine, who typed the manuscript, and to her husband, Mr. E. Andrew Peterson, who helped organize the manuscript and did some of the typing. I also wish to acknowledge the timely help of Mrs. Grace Lott, Bowdoin's Government Department Secretary, in coordinating the typing of the manuscript.

I salute several people who helped in the research: Mark Tereson, Allie Middleton, Ed Lee, Ken Santagata, Kristen Keller, and Sue McDonough. All were at the time Bowdoin students. In addition, Leslie Goldenthal of Litchfield, Maine, gave me substantial assistance in sending out the questionnaire and tabulating the responses.

I also wish to say special thanks to Allen E. Miller of Brunswick, Maine, for his perceptive observations in the schools, for his elaborate notes and shrewd assessments, and for the many hours of clarifying conversation in which we sought to understand the complex phenomena we were daily experiencing.

The relation of my wife Carla to the project was unique. During the field research and since, she has been teaching the fifth grade at the Morse Street Elementary School in Freeport. Since the Freeport school system was one of the four programs I studied, this put her in a singular position vis-a-vis my research. On the one hand we seldom, during the field research, talked specifics, or talked about persons, and if we did it was in general terms. On the other hand, we talked long, often, and deeply about education and teaching, the position of the teacher and the relation of teacher and child. I visited her classroom several times. During the latter part of my project, Carla was writing her thesis on "The Effects of Sex Differences in Children in their School Experience." This proved an eye opener for me and further confirmed my growing belief that school is not only for children, but must be seen as a structure of relations in which learning either goes on among all affected, including especially the adults, or, failing that, learning is to that degree eroded for everyone, including especially the children. The exhaustive and mind-leaping exchanges we had about this and many other questions, helped me enormously. On the other hand, my judgments are necessarily my own, and do not necessarily reflect those of Carla's or those of anyone else who was related to the project.

Part I

THE BASIS OF THE STUDY

Chapter One

The Original Plan of the Study

The impulse with which I began in 1971 was a general desire to understand more clearly the problems of social change, not so much the what of it, but the how of it.

I had been active during the previous ten years in change programs and movements. In the early sixties (1962-66) I was an educational adviser for the United States Agency for International Development to the governments of Kenya and Tanzania. Thereafter, as a teacher at Bowdoin and as a citizen, I became engaged in college innovational programs; in student movements; in black studies programs; in community action programs; and in political activity that included taxation, education, and ecological issues, and action against the Vietnam war.

This experience led me to want to do research that would focus on the area that lies between the aims of the practitioners of change and the results of their efforts. I described this area in my funding proposal to the Office of Education in November, 1971, as "the process of effecting change."

I decided to pursue the inquiry in the field of educational reform. This seemed a natural for me--partly because much of my previous experience as an actor in the process of change had been in this field; partly because the Brunswick-Freeport area of mid-coast Maine was sprouting a surprising number and variety of educational change programs, both in the public and private sphere; partly because several of these programs were accompanied by substantial and at times explosive community involvement; partly because I was generally familiar with the scene, and regarded such familiarity as an invaluable, perhaps necessary pre-condition for successfully carrying out of this kind of research; and partly because I sensed at the time something that has since been borne out by my experience in doing the research, namely, that educational reform programs, especially in a microcosm, offer a unique and rich opportunity to examine the politics of change.

I asked myself at that time, with respect to this latter point, are there lessons to be learned--and what kind of lessons--from an analysis of educational change programs that would bear on the human quest for an effective mode of "getting there from here?" And I meant by that not just an instrumentalist concern of finding the right means, the cleverest, swiftest, most direct, most efficacious, most economical, methods and techniques for successfully accomplishing a given change--though that is very much involved. But I meant by that as well the discovery of styles and strategies for effectuating change that would enable a social scientist and/or a practitioner to anticipate that these and these modes of operation and behavior will bring forth the kind of change which it was the intention to work for.

This latter is a more substantive concern which overlays the more instrumentalist one. Of course, the substance in question is "relative"--*i.e.*, it depends on what this or that change agent(s) in a given case had in mind. But, granted that one might be able to discover what they had in mind, and what their intention was, and granted that one could examine the operationalization, then, I reasoned, it might be possible to focus on the styles and strategies that tended to maximize--or minimize--the bringing forth of change.

How often, I said to myself, do I not see people (and have I not been one of them myself) who feel genuinely concerned that change shall take place--for a great variety of reasons; who identify things they want to see changed; who postulate certain goals; who launch into action with more or less carefully wrought plans, programs and designs for change. But...Is there fulfillment? Or is something else fulfilled? Did or did not the change or changes stick? Did they go deeply enough? Was the character or "style" of the actions involved in implementing the desired change in a state of approximate verisimilitude with the perceived aims of the program? Or was it a case of do as I say, not as I do? Does the program recall the old French proverb that the more things change the more they stay the same? Or, did putting something into practice reveal that the change agents had something other in mind than what they thought, or said they thought, they had in mind at the beginning?

I felt some light could be cast upon these questions by doing research on the process of "getting there from here"--to delineate the significant factors that interact in the process of change.

I began with a model for analysis which comprised a figure-ground concept[1] and a group of nine elements in a state of interaction within the model. (I then used the word transaction, following John Dewey's lead).[2] In my grant application I used the following image to convey the anatomy of this approach.

"I imagine as in a moving picture a swimming coach, a swimmer taking instruction from the coach (to learn something new), and a beach filled with other swimmers, sunbathers, kids, dogs, balloons, life guards, park attendants and officials. In this picture, and it must be emphasized that it is moving through time, as well as located spa-

---

1. This conceptual model is analogous to certain kinds of systems analysis which have begun to develop in social and political science in the past decade. For a general treatment and critique of systems analysis see the last section of Introduction to Systematic Political Science by David H. Everson and Joann P. Paine, Dorsey Press, 1973.

2. He develops this concept in a work he did in collaboration with Arthur F. Bentley, Knowing and the Known, Boston, 1949.

tially, the coach and swimmer together constitute the figure; and the beach with its occupants and paraphernalia, constitute the ground.

"Applied to my research project, the figure corresponds to the educational change project. The ground corresponds to the immediate environment within which the change project is being carried on. The figure-in-motion (not the ground) is the object/subject of my research. I identify nine elements in a state of transaction. They are: the kind of change sought (i.e., goals or aims); the identity of the bringer(s) of change (the coach in the above image); the identity of the target or client population (the swimmer above); the structure of the relationship between the above two; the style of communication between them; the pace or tempo in getting the changes introduced; the way in which problems emanating from the environment, the ground, are handled; changes in the bringer(s) of change; and changes in the target population."

My research included four change programs in education in the Brunswick-Freeport area of mid-coast Maine: 1) an upheaval in the Freeport Public School System and the introduction of significant changes in the elementary schools, 1969-74; 2) less overtly dramatic but also significant struggle in the Brunswick Public Schools, accompanied by the introduction of a large, new, open-structured elementary school, 1970-74; 3) the founding and implementation of a private free school in Freeport, 1969-74; and the establishment and implementation of an Upward Bound project at Bowdoin College, 1966-73. The end-dates given are not terminal with respect to the projects; they indicate rather the time-range of the research project--the point at which I felt there was enough data to indicate the trend the program was taking.

Applying this conceptual model, I sought to test several propositions that I tentatively formulated.

First Problems in the figure (change agent and client population) that emanate from the ground are dealt with differently by the change agent than problems encountered within the figure as such. I postulated that there is a class of actions which are defensive in nature (winning and preserving and perhaps even expanding "space" for the program vis-à-vis the ground); and that there is a class of actions that are creative or positive in nature (winning and sustaining fulfillment of aims within the program).

Second The general understanding of aims by people in the program, and their understanding of the problems to be resolved in carrying out the aims, is modified over time as the aims are operationalized. I postulated that this modification is a function of multiple forces "let loose" in and because of the change process. The modifications are "out of proportion" to the original aims and cannot be accounted for by linear models of change (cf. the discussion immediately below on my search of the related research).

Third The need to compromise and modify aims experienced by people in the change process, stems from two different sources: first, from the learning experience of putting something new into practice; and second, from the pressures to routinize impinging on the _figure_ from the _ground_. These latter pressures tend to intrude themselves into the change process mostly through the defensive responses of the leaders to the need to survive.

Fourth The leaders of the change program are engaged in a duality of roles: Role I is defending the program (the _figure_) from what seem to be damaging interventions from external forces (the _ground_); Role II is being an initiating and sustaining force in carrying forward the learning experience of a group of people, including themselves as leaders, engaged in operationalizing the aims of the program. It was assumed by me that success in carrying forward the program requires that the leaders play both roles effectively, even though these roles seem to be in a state of actual or potential contradiction.

Chapter Two

Search of the Related Research

Before going on to an explanation of how my way of conceptualizing changed and how my questions were modified in the process of doing and writing the research, I should write briefly about my search of the related research in educational change which I conducted both before and early on in the project.

Research, both empirical and analytic, has been heavy in the past ten years on innovation and change in education. William McClelland, in a presidential address to the Division of Military Psychology, American Psychological Association in 1968, underscored this by noting:[3]

> ". . .that many disciplines, many professions and many public and private agencies are vitally concerned with this topic. Aspects of change have been studied by rural sociologists, cultural anthropologists, psychiatrists, communications specialists, management and industrial engineers, educators, and all manner of psychologists. . . The word 'innovation' enjoys as great popularity today as the word 'systems' ten years ago!"

He lamented, however, that there is not very much research of a kind "that will make a difference relatively soon in how we go about solving problems in education. . . . How does one really move," he asked, "from research to development to application and use? . . . The process of change as practiced is still pretty much of an art form."[4] He called for an approach that emphasizes "directed contact change," which he defined as "a deliberate and collaborative process involving an agent of change and a client system."[5]

---

[3] Wm. A. McClelland, The Process of Effecting Change, George Washington University, Human Resources Research Office, 1968.

I felt an immediate kinship with this, that we were both trying to get at a similar, and widely neglected, set of phenomena, what I called above "the in-between" factors (in-between aim and result). However, he does not provide in his model for a way of dealing with problems involving the relationship of change agent and client that stem from the environment in which that relationship is moving. Furthermore, he regards change agent and client as two inter-acting systems, where I see them as part of a whole transactional process. Finally, his conception of change veers too closely to linear notions for me to be wholly comfortable with it without more empirical investigation, as in this passage on what ideally is supposed to happen to the client:[6]

> "It takes time for the client to travel the majestic route from awareness of the innovation, to the arousal of interest, to an evaluation of the idea, through an actual trial to arrive finally at adoption or rejection."

McClelland's lament about the paucity of work which gets at the actual process of effecting change finds quantitative confirmation in a study in 1970 by Louis M. Maguire. He reports that of four categories into which bibliographies on change may be divided (namely, Organization and Innovation; Processes of Change; Diffusion of Innovations; and Knowledge Utilization and Dissemination) that Processes of Change has 170 entries, whereas the others respectively and in order have 650, 1,100, and 4,000 entries.[7]

---

[4] Ibid., p. 1 and p. 3.

[5] Ibid.

[6] Ibid., p. 6.

Maguire also notes other gaps in the literature that relate to my research. For example, the insistence of the literature on the need to identify the real problem and formulate clear goals before you move ahead with a change program. This is laudable, he notes, but in real life there may be a political need not to be that clear about goals. Furthermore, there is little agreement about what the real problem is. Who defines a problem as the problem? Are you dealing only with symptons when you thought you were dealing with problems? He avers that "an elaborate scheme for consultation and conflict resolution is needed."[8]

Maguire points to a characteristic of the literature, which I also noted in my search, "that most of it is addressed to how school districts can take on discrete changes such as team teaching, programmed instruction, non-

---

7. Louis M. Maguire, Observations and Analysis of the Literature of Change, Research for Better Schools, Inc., Philadelphia, 1970, p. 5.

8. Ibid., p. 2.

gradedness, and modular scheduling."[9] Research aimed at better understanding of the processes of change involved in introducing such discrete changes may be good so far as it goes. But one must also "consider efforts to enhance change capability as a pre-requisite for taking on discrete changes."[10] Or to put the point in a way that sees it from the other end, the introduction of any discrete change has to be seen as an intervention into a system which may produce multiple sets of consequences reverberating back and forth upon one another in a manner that goes well beyond the mere incorporation of a discrete change in that system.

Finally, Maguire assesses various models of the change process. He mentions the Clark-Guba model, which I comment on in a moment; the Rogers model, which McClelland draws on substantially; and the Lippett-Watson-Westley model. He says of these and of the many others that have been formulated, that

> "each of these formulations of the change process has strengths and weaknesses, [but] a general weakness that applies to most of them is that they seem to view, or at least report, change as a formal, rational process."

If he means by rational that it is a fairly linear and mechanical conception of cause and effect in change projects, then I agree that his criticism is well taken. Of course, these models may nevertheless be helpful and must be kept in mind while doing research.

---

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 3.

[10] *Ibid.*, p. 3.

One such model, that I find impressive, and especially the thinking behind it, is that of Clark-Guba. They write:[11]

> "How many articles have been published in education bemoaning the research reports which have been gathering dust on library shelves instead of influencing school practice? It seems to us that such disuse is probably appropriate since most research, even that which can be defended from a scientific point of view, has little to say to practitioners. And why should it? Research is conducted to advance knowledge and not directly to influence practice . . . But researchers are being castigated for not tackling 'real problems,' while practitioners build up guilt feelings because they are not using research to make decisions."

They feel that the "dilemma is rooted in oversimplification of, and an ignorance of, the range of processes and functions which effect change in a social process field."[12]

The statement is similar to how I saw the problem of research, too, and to how I tried to formulate a viable model using a transactional approach.

They present a scheme which has four phases and all together 8 steps as follows:[13]

I. Research (to advance knowledge)

II. Development
  Invention (to innovate)
  Design (to engineer)

---

11. David L. Clark and Egon G. Guba, *An Examination of Potential Change Roles in Education*, NEA, Washington, D. C., Center for the Study of Instruction, 1965.

12. *Ibid.*, p. 3.

13. *Ibid.*, p. 8.

III. Diffusion
    Dissemination (to inform)
    Demonstration (to build conviction)

IV. Adoption
    Trial (to test)
    Installation (to operationalize)
    Institutionalization (to establish)

This classification of steps in the change process is well worked out. Even so, I felt uncomfortable with it because it imposes such a neat, one-way, mechanically ordered design on reality. They are self-critical of their model. "The seemingly sequential flow can easily be over-emphasized," they write.[14] Also, "the scheme represents a unidimensional analysis of change roles, but of course such roles are influenced and determined by a multi-dimensional range of variables not entirely accommodated by the structure."[15] Furthermore, the schema "has been constructed on logical grounds largely unsupported by empirical research;" and they note the relative paucity of such research.

To me such comments represented an opportunity and a challenge to do the kind of empirical research that might get at "the multi-dimensional range of variables" and internal feed-back effects, and to do this without throwing out the strengths of deliberateness, analytical differentiation, and sequential flow that characterize the work of Clark and Guba.

I found several works that seemed helpful with respect to different aspects of my inquiry. Arthur H. Niehoff deals in a creative way with patterns of interchanges between change agents and clients.[16] R. Chin has developed a meaningful classification of levels of change sought and/or achieved by change projects.[17] A look through recent literature on the interactional process yielded an interesting article by McCroskey and Wright on "Intermediate Interaction Behavior" in small group communication. They monitored the dialogs of five students on a topic of current concern and confirmed their suspicion "that [intermediate interaction behaviors] are multidimensional in nature."[18]

---

[14] Ibid., p. 9.

[15] Ibid., p. 4.

It is clear from this account that my excursions into the literature on educational change confirmed my impression that there was a paucity of work done on the natural history of the change process and that insofar as efforts were being made to understand, or theorize about, this process, that the conceptualizations tended to be overly biased towards a linear model. The Clark-Guba model, described above,

---

16. Arthur H. Niehoff, *The Process of Cross Cultural Innovation*. Professional Paper 30-37. George Washington University, 1967.

17. R. Chin, "Basic Strategies and Procedures in Effecting Change" in *Designing Education for the Future No. 3: Planning and Effecting Needed Change in Education*, E. L. Morphet and C. O. Ryan, Eds., New York, 1957.

18. G. C. McCroskey and David W. Wright, "The Development of Instrument for Measuring Intermediate Interaction Behavior in Small Group Communication." Illinois State University, Communication Research Center, 1971.

was, I felt, a good case in point. It is an astonishingly clear model because it provides a sophisticated, linear, sequential break-down of the process into eight steps, each with its own identifiable motivation. For example, the motivation for the Invention step is to innovate, the motivation for the Demonstration step is to build conviction, for the Installation step to operationalize. Quite possibly, in a very rough and general sense the process of "getting there from here" does follow this pattern from Research (step one) to Development (Invention and Design, steps 2 and 3) to Diffusion (Dissemination and Demonstration, steps 4 and 5) to Adoption (Trial, Installation, and Institutionalization, steps 6, 7, and 8). Or, quite possibly, this is the way change should take place, according to scholars and reformers. But whether it actually does or could take place in this way is doubtful.

Clark and Guba's criticism of their model is basic in this regard and refreshing, and helps give it clarity. They observe that it's easy to over-emphasize the sequential flow. I would add that there seems no necessary movement from one step to another; each step seems self-contained. Their further criticism that change roles are not so unidimensional, as the scheme seems to assume, relates to the same point. That is, after the fact one can go in and say yes here was a movement from A to Z via any number of intervening steps (I'd prefer to say events, situations, structural shake-ups, etc.) but what factors were present in the overall flow remain relatively opaque, if not indeed obscured by the seemingly "rational" design.

Further questions:

(a) It is true that research tends not to be read or read very well by practitioners, nor even by innovators. This is a problem of practice, but also a problem of theory. That is, the research may simply not be very good--and therefore isn't the weakness of theory more than merely food for academic hand wringing . . . about the lack of good reading habits by practitioners?

(b) Initial goals often tend to be expressed in vague, generalized ways, or as slogans. This is a phenomenon that is partly political no doubt, as suggested by Maguire above. But might it not also be partly a function of the practical problem of the divorce, or gap between theory and practice? Theory seems not to touch practice at that vital point.

(c) The how of what is institutionalized would seem to be as important as the what. Wouldn't the linear model tend to ignore that, or depreciate the sense in which the how may tend, however imperceptibly, and legitimately, to alter the what?

(d) In the implementation phases, pressures to alter, dilute, modify or expand on the original aims gather great force. Might one suppose that only in these phases do the aims "come out" for what they "really"are?

(e) To say that something has been established (last phase in Clark/Guba) may beg the question. What has been institutionalized? Was it the change as originally sought? For example, in a given school system there may be a new program established called the new math. But has anything really changed in the school system, or in the teaching and learning of math? Is there greater flexibility, for example? greater, more supple use of mind in matters of number? greater facility in thinking through alternative modes of doing problems and a greater sense of personal efficacy in those doing it? These may well have been some of the things the founders and innovators of the new math wanted, or had in their mind.

If there is a gap between what they wanted and what actually was established (even though in the literal sense a "new math program" was established)--how and why? What factors need to be "added in?" Was the new math only a discrete change introduced into school systems, accompanied or not by the other discrete changes such as modular scheduling, team teaching, and the like? Might it be that though it was "introduced" and "adopted," that it made no basic improvement in that system's overall change capability, nor in the basic pattern of relationships in the school, nor in basic assumptions about learning? Might it be that the letter of the new math was adopted but the spirit, the "message," was not. In that case, the steps of the

Clark/Guba model may have been faithfully mirrored in the introduction, implementation, and establishment of new math, but nothing essentially changed.[19]

Or, take a contrary example. Over here, in this school system (Freeport, Maine) a new reading program of the sequential, orderly, step-by-step variety has been introduced. It was adopted and established and several years later not only has reading improved markedly, both as learned and as taught, but there have been positive spill-over effects throughout the elementary system--so much so that both learning and teaching in all subjects is much more of a comfortable and creative experience. Again, how and why? What factors would need to be "added in" for the linear model _a la_ Clark/Guba to make more sense?

My conclusion, confirmed by these investigations and questions, was to abandon the notion of "adding in" and instead to experiment with a non-linear approach that would enable me to "see" sets of factors that needed to be juxtaposed and needed to be treated for what they were, as modes of human behavior in a state of dynamic interaction. I didn't want to cast out the sense provided by linear notions of a movement from here to there, and that "in the world" one thing does tend to follow upon another. But I needed a way of looking that would help me see the whole in the parts and the parts in the whole, and to see the interaction of parts and the whole in units of time--or, as I came later to describe it to myself, borrowing from Aristotle a little, as ends and means united in and through the activity of the thing in motion.

---

[19] Seymour B. Sarason discusses the fate of programs such as the new math in a meaningful way, identifying the problem in the context of a cultural-systemic analysis in _The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change_. Allyn and Bacon, Inc., Boston, 1971.

I thought I had found a good model along the lines of what I described in Chapter One above.

Chapter Three

Concept Development and Modification

I was gradually led to adopt my original conceptual model, not in the sense of abandoning it, but of modifying it substantially. This came about as a result of doing the research, monitoring the applicability of the model, analyzing the data, and doing the preliminary writing up.

I altered my approach and design in four ways. First, I moved from a systems-model in the gestalt mode to a more avowedly structural model. Secondly, I moved over from a "change" orientation as such to an avowedly "growth" orientation which includes change. Thirdly, I moved away from seeing the political problem as primarily a function of a figure/ground dichotomy to seeing the political problem as a function of the distinction between distributive behavior and growth behavior both in figure and ground. And, finally, I clarified my own ideas concerning which belief-style in education, or concept of growth, was most in accord with my own convictions.

The reasons why I altered my approach and design became compelling as I did the study. I can arrange the arguments around three difficulties that I encountered.

First, I was overdoing the figure-ground dichotomy. I was seeing it too much as a dichotomy and therefore I lost sight of the unity-in-life of the figure and the ground. I was too much pre-supposing tension and contradiction between the change program and its environment. Though this exists, and I found much evidence for it, nevertheless it led me to over-emphasize this factor at the expense of a more realistic assessment of the constraints _also_ taking place within the figure itself (between and among change agent and client population).

I found myself too often, for example, thinking of the figure-ground dichotomy as a general equivalent of a distinction between educational and political. In my mind's eye I "saw" pressures impinging from the ground solely as political pressures deeply affecting the scope and follow-through capability of program leaders (change agents) in their relations with and within the figure. In turn I "saw" this impact as coming "from without" and as tending to be adverse to the development and expansion of the program and to the fulfillment of its aims. A fair caricature of how I was symbolically structuring what I was seeing would be that over here is an island of progress and relative unity and creativity and it is floating in a sea of backwardness and conflicting cross currents, most of them hostile, and the island is manned by heroes courageously defending against the storm, determined to keep the island not only afloat but progressive.

This was a simplified and romantic picture. It was good guys _versus_ bad guys. This is indicated by the lebelled distinction I drew between defensive actions on the part of change agents over against the ground and creative actions on their part with and within the figure. I was uncomfortably yoked to a terminology, if not to a concept, that pulled me in a direction of making the behavior of change agents within the figure that seemed political merely a function of outside pressures. As such the data did not support this. It is and remains an important factor. But the implication cannot be supported that change agents in education (or in general) are somehow less "political" than other types of leaders in or out of education, and that when they are (unfortunately) "political," they are more or less forced into it because of pressures from "the outside." That original implication had been willy nilly structured into my approach via the dichotomous (either/or) relationship I posited between figure and ground, and the correlative non-dichotomous relationship I posited between change agent and the client population. I needed a better concept.

The difficulties also became very apparent empirically. Where does one draw the line between figure and ground? This has been a problem in all systems analysis where, though the terminology used is system and environment, the problem of adequate demarcation is the same.[20] In a general way, this had seemed plausible, and it still does, but only in a general way. It seemed easiest with respect to Collins Brook Free School, because it was a separate, independent entity. Even there it became a moot point whether the parents of the day kids were part of the figure or part of the ground. The problem of drawing a boundary around change programs in the Freeport and Brunswick public school systems to fit the figure-ground dichotomy was even greater. Who was to be excluded from the figure? Taxpayers? Board members? The Superintendent? Oppositionists only? Some sympathizers, not others? All those"involved?" That latter seemed good for a while, but in fact it denuded the ground of all but inchoate and passive "forces." I decided after a time to leave it to the self-interpretation of the respective change agents--and wrote the questionnaire for them partly from that point of view. But leaving it up to them eroded the overall conceptual, objective, usefulness of the dichotomy, though it remained as a factor in their perception which could be taken into account. In the event, few of the change agents understood the dichotomy; or they applied it in a haphazard way. I took that as a reflection on the suitability of the dichotomy rather than a reflection on them.

---

[20] Everson and Paine, op. cit..

Gradually, there took place in my mind the need to modify my approach and modes of conceptualizing. The concept of structure began to form in my mind, both from the data and from the additional reading I was doing on related conceptual frameworks.[21] I began to perceive and use structure in a broader and fuller way than I had ever previously done. I had before this generally seen and used structure as meaning primarily an organization of roles and of individuals in these roles; or, simply, as organization.

I came to regard as a fundamental of behavior that human beings, in pursuit of their activities, enact structures. A structure, as I now perceived and conceived it, is an "in-motion" ordering of roles; a set of relationships among persons in these roles, both formal and informal; and a set or sets of communicated meanings, often at variance with one another, about these roles and relationships. People enact structures on a daily basis, enacting and re-enacting them, changing over time, trying to survive and to grow.

Change programs I began to view as structural variants whose intention it is to reshape or alter in some way existing patterns, definitions and assumptions regarding the ordering of roles, relationships, and meanings.

---

[21] I continued an inquiry earlier begun with John Dewey and Arthur Bentley (*Knowing and the Known*). I took up the work of Wolfgang Kohler; then of R. D. Laing; and I went on to study the approaches taken by such "phenomenologists" and "structuralists" as Claude Levi Strauss, Merleau Ponty, and Louis Althusser; and I found myself responding positively to the event-centered epistemology of French social scientist Edgar Morin (*Rumour in Orleans*). I also later found much provocative material in the panels and papers on epistemology at the American Political Science Convention in 1973, especially papers by Kenneth Harris and Tracy Strong.

Change programs happen when some human beings try to intervene consciously in the flow of human structuring in order to bend it this way or that way. Thus, instead of figure/ground, applied in a dichotomous way, I now symbolized in my mind's eye a social field of forces in a state of interaction. The social field occurs as the result of activity that is being carried on by a set of people; for example, educational activity.

In a change situation, one finds some forces engaged in a conscious effort to affect the flow of all other forces in one direction or another. They trigger responses and reactions that reverberate back and forth throughout the social field. Or, to put it another way, I now saw the social field of forces as a structure of activity in which tendencies towards a new structure were trying to emerge and to alter to some greater degree or less the existing structure. What I sought, and felt I had found, was a way of seeing that enabled me to encompass all of the relevant forces as part of a single set of transactions-- wherever they might occur within the social field. Then and only then would it make sense to isolate and identify for closer inspection the focal point or points at which pressures for and against change had occurred or were occurring. In this sense there is figure and ground, figure being those focal pressure-points, and ground that from out of which they come.

A second type of difficulty with my original approach--

in addition to dichotomizing, and simplifying, the relationship between change program and its environment--was an overly de facto bias, deriving to a degree from a fear of not being "scientific" enough.

Though regarding myself as not a behaviorist, I shared with behaviorism a respect for describing what is as distinct from what ought to be, and therefore I was wary of normative analyses and approaches. But, in company with many behaviorists, and perhaps this is a feature of behaviorism as a school, I tended to think that just because I was not going to deal in prescriptions, just because I was not going to engage in normative analysis of what ought to be, that therefore I would be looking at what is. Yet that does not follow, either in logic, or in practice. To describe and analyze what is, is a far more complex matter than to purge oneself of prescriptive urges, though that is a complex process in itself, and a necessary component in the act of perceiving one's "visual field."

I sought objectivity; I sought awareness of my own subjectivity; but I began to feel the need for more. The model I had started out with seemed to imply that anything was, or could be, a change program just because it said it was, or came on in the world as if it were one. As my research progressed I found myself reconnoitering the roots of my original impetus--my vital reasons for doing the research in the first place. It was to chart how in the progress (or forward motion) of things aims got realized, or modified, or defeated, and if possible to shed light on why.

It did not seem enough, therefore, only to chart the apparent behaviorial manifestations of the changing and/or persisting patterns of relationships of people and roles in and around change programs. It did not seem enough to relate these manifestations to higher or lower levels of change sought (higher or lower in reference to where the ground was "at"). Nor did it seem enough to relate these manisfestations to the existence, and relative "amounts," of "defensive" versus "creative" actions on the part of change agents; nor to chart the degree to which compromise is the result of pressures from the "outside" versus the degree to which it may also be the result of new breakthroughs experienced by people in the process of "doing it." And so forth. This is a fair statement of what I thought I could limit myself to in the interest of doing a reasonably objective and workable project.

Four months after I began the field research (September, 1972) I found myself posing the question, "But what is the concept of change which animates or in various ways conditions the approach and behavior of the people I'm interviewing? Is it change itself, or is it something else? I worked out a complex questionnaire over the next half year, and in the spring of 1973 gave the questionnaire to most of those I had interviewed and received back 56 of the 110 I had sent out.

This represented some shift from the instrumentalist biases of my original approach. I was getting closer to the picture in the heads (Walter Lippman's phrase) of the people in and out of the change programs--closer to what they perceived to be the meaning of their programs and the meaning of the way in which they were relating, moving, behaving in the actual operations of those programs.

It wasn't as if I had now shifted away from is towards an ought orientation. Rather it was that the is which I was examining was seen to be charged with the urgency of substantive change; and consequently charged with real arguments concerning the meaning of educational activity and the structuring it ought to have. People's reasons embraced more than their psychic responses to external stimuli and went beyond that to a sense of better and worse, and to a set of questions and convictions about the desirable ordering of a common structure.

Thus more and more I had to treat the objects of my study as subjects, themselves undergoing change in the process of fighting for and against change. I needed, and saw the need for, the category of might be (or might not be) as a way of understanding the is that I was trying to monitor.

In the continuing process of doing interviews, delving into the answers to the questionnaire, and writing up preliminary sketches of concepts and data, I realized a double perception: (a) everyone was concerned about, and seemed to engage himself or herself in these new programs--or against them--on behalf of growth; everyone was animated by, conditioned by, a passion for the growth of human beings through education. Secondly, each one had a notion, sometimes a well wrought belief, of how growth could most feasibly, most "rightly," take place.

I began to classify the typical forms which these beliefs, or belief styles, took. I did this on the basis of what I was learning from the data, and from my own thinking about the data. Six types emerged: traditional; individualist; achievement; open; free; and differentiated. They are described in Part II, Chapter Three.

With this additional flesh on my conceptual bones, I took another look at the political element. If structure meant a continuous, in-motion interplay of roles, relationships, and meanings; if among the fusions of roles, relationships, and meanings in the activity of education there appeared several, often conflicting, belief-styles of how that activity is to be conducted most "rightly;" and if this was or could be at any time an issue between student and teacher, teacher and teacher, teacher and parent, teacher and administrator, administrator and board member;--then isn't politics a root part of educational structure?

I began to perceive politics to mean primarily an effort at distributing things and values. I saw this as something different from producing or creating or discovering (uncovering) such things or values--though in the act of distributing something, "more" may be produced, created, discovered--

or something "less." Distributiveness, I saw, was present in every way and at every point in the educational process. At times it seemed to collide with the attainment of growth for the participants in the educational environment; at times it seemed to be an indispensable, and necessary part of enabling growth to happen; and at times it seemed to be so much an ingredient part of successful learning that I teetered on the verge at times of seeing a fusion of distributiveness and growth, a creative connection. But in any case I saw that change programs have, or perhaps even need, more politics than is "normal" in order to get them going and to sustain them, and that it makes little sense to presuppose that this is somehow a blemish, or something that hadn't ought to be, or is a "regrettable" function of pressures "from out there."

A third difficulty, or challenge, I encountered during the research was my growing awareness that I had not made explicit my own basic beliefs about education. As I indicated above, I gradually became aware of several distinct belief-styles held by the people I was interviewing. I eventually distinguished six: traditional; individualistic; achievement; open; free; and differentiated. Weighing these in my own mind I sorted out what I myself believed. I became convinced that for me the best kind of approach to education was a differentiated one.

From my visits to many very different kinds of classrooms, and from my learning to be skeptical of liberal dogmas, I began to notice more and more that children and teachers being what they are, that children and teachers being what they can become, that parents being what they are (and *might* become) that given this, and given the infinite variety and complexity of human situations, and given the unique and profound simplicity of the exchange between teacher and student when it is good and they know it to be good;--that no one style is "right" for *every* student in a group, whether an open or free or traditional style, that no one style is necessarily "right" for the *same* student *all the time*; and that for this time and place and for this student and teacher now, there is a way of proceeding that will, can, enable optimum growth to take place.

A basic factor in finding a good way to proceed, "here and now, in this situation," is a consciousness present among the people in the schoolroom and in the system, that a differentiated approach needs to be applied. This frees the practitioner to pursue what may seem to be "traditional" methods here, an "open" approach there, or an "achievement" emphasis over there. In other words, there would have to exist the "consciousness of differentiation" in order for this flexibility and seriousness of purpose to succeed. Thus, differentiated education is a belief-style in its own right, not a set of eclectic additions culled from other styles.

This perception and growing belief on my part, coming as it did as a result of doing the research, was exciting to me, and it also significantly helped me to monitor my pre-research value biases regarding other belief-styles. I had preferred open or free (not distinguishing them at that point) and had felt traditional and achievement styles were passé or inadequate. I can now see that the latter types may be useful in some circumstances and in any case are expressions of a concern for growth. I also can see that open or free styles may not be applicable in some circumstances and may become dogmatic and consequently create barriers to growth, even though I remain convinced that they represent deep commitments to growth, and are in many circumstances to be valued above others.

Having my own standards clarified thus helped me to gain greater research distance from the subjects of my study, helped me to put their conflicts and their rhetoric and their struggles in a wider trans-factional theoretical frame. At the same time, since I also felt theoretical sympathy (or empathy) with each of these belief-styles, and found the struggles of their adherents reflected back in my own processes of seeking answers to seemingly insoluble problems, because of this, I felt that I could "enter in" to their experience in a vital way. I did not see myself as a traditional social scientist armed only with objective measuring devices, coldly aloof from the "objects" of his study.

To sum up these conceptual changes: I shifted from a more or less gestalt oriented approach, in which figure and ground appeared too much in a dichotomous relationship, to a more unified structural approach. Secondly, this allowed greater attention to be focused on the interplay of political and educational factors--which I began to perceive, and conceive, as a continuing encounter between, and blending of, distributive and growth concerns. Thirdly, I shifted from a more narrowly instrumental conception of change to a set of concepts which identify substentive beliefs in "right" education. And finally, I shifted from a lack of an articulated belief about what constitutes for me a good education to a growing awareness that a differentiated model contains a fair statement of what I think is educationally best, and that this belief both helps and conditions my research activity.

Chapter Four

Modification of the Four Original Hypotheses

The four original hypotheses underwent substantial change.

The first one, concerning the presence of a class of defensive and a class of creative actions was changed into a class of actions that are more heavily distributive in character and a class of actions that are more heavily growth-oriented in character. Educational leadership came to be tied in with the question of the degree to which such leadership is able, given appropriate circumstances, to employ a distributive activity with a high growth pay-off.

In terms of the more limited nature of the hypothesis, however, the data seems to support the assumption that leadership actions in change programs tend to reflect the presence of distributive concerns and of growth concerns in varying patterns of weight to one side or the other.

My second original hypothesis concerned the expectation of finding sets of forces "let loose" in the process of striving for change which were "out of proportion" to the original aims of the change program. This hypothesis remained the same, and the data seem abundantly to support it. The explication of the nine factors in Part Two will show how and to what degree this phenomenon was encountered in the study.

The third original hypothesis assumed that compromise stems *both* from the learning experience of putting something new into practice and from pressures to routinize impinging on the figure from the ground. This proposition was changed. I now sought to distinguish whether the direction of compromise was towards satisfying distributive concerns or towards satisfying growth concerns--regardless of whether the *source* of pressure to compromise was figure *or* ground. The data led me to this and in turn supported it.

The fourth original hypothesis concerned the duality of roles experienced by the leaders of change programs, one role being to sustain and increase the energy level within the program and the other to protect and preserve it from outside pressures. I continued to use that way of formulating the duality, but I super-imposed the further interpretive hypothesis that the duality of roles was also a function of trade-offs a leader makes between growth factors and distributive factors--again regardless of whether pressures to move in one of these directions or the other came from inside the program or outside. I thus hypothesized that though the generation of pressures for growth would tend to come mostly from within the program, and through pressures needing a distributive type of resolution would tend to come mostly from without, nevertheless the reverse would also be shown to be true: that the program too would be a significant source of distributive pressure on the leader, and the social environment outside the program would to a degree be a source of pressures for growth upon the leader. Therefore, once again, the distinction between distributive and growth factors emerged as equally if not more important than the distinction between figure and ground.

Chapter Five

The Discovery of Nine Factors Interacting in the Process of Change

Analysis of the data showed the presence of at least nine significant factors in various states of interaction in the process of change. First, the heterogeneity of individuals, groups and classes represented in the social field. This is a situation containing the potential for felt discontinuity of experience, interests, and goals among these individuals, groups and classes.

Second, the dialectic of rebellion. The behavioral and empirical indicators of rebellion are defiance, emulation, and prophecy (the latter being an orientation to new values).

Third, the articulation in practice of various, and often conflicting, belief-styles.

Fourth, the manner of commitment to these belief-styles, whether in the reactive mode, the maintenance mode, or the self-examined mode.

Fifth, the degree of consciousness reflected in the behavior and actions of the practitioners.

Sixth, the direction of compromise, whether it is more towards distributive or more towards growth concerns.

Seventh, the articulation in practice, in the behavior and actions of the practitioners, of various strategies--whether there is a consciousness of strategy (an overlap with the fifth factor above) and what form the strategies take.

Eighth, the pattern of organization of roles that evolves over time and of personnel changes in these roles.

Ninth, the mode or modes of leadership that evolve over time.

These nine are taken up at some length in Part II and constitute the main body of concepts around which the data is organized, analyzed, and explained.

These nine recall to some degree "the nine elements in a state of transaction"[22] which I originally sought to test for in my original gestalt approach. There is some overlap, but there is no one-for-one correlation; and the newer categories are richer in content. The kind of change sought suggests belief-styles. The identity of the practitioners suggests the factors of rebellion and consciousness. The structure of relationships within the figure, style of communication and the pace of change suggests all together patterns of organization, consciousness, strategy, and modes of leadership. The handling of problems coming in from the environment suggests direction of compromise. And, finally, changes within the practitioners suggests the dialectic of rebellion. So that I perceive continuity from the original nine to the later nine. But I also perceive much change, and hopefully substantial growth, in the development of the new categories.

---

[22] Page 5 supra. I will re-state them here for convenience: First, the kind of change sought (i.e., goals or aims); second, the identity of the change agent; third, the identity of the target or client population; fourth, the structure of the relationship between change agent and target population; fifth, the style of communication between them; sixth, the pace of change; seventh, the way in which problems emanating from the environment (ground) are handled; eighth, changes in the change agent; ninth, changes in the target population.

Chapter Six

Epistemological Approach, Research Anatomy and Research Strategy

Epistemology

I will sum up some major points that relate to my approach and conceptual organization.

First, I try to deal with what "is;" not with what "ought to be." The "is" that I seek to describe and understand remains, however, a perceived set of behaviors that in their existential reality lie outside the ultimate grasp of my concepts, my generalizations, my instruments of measurement, and my best thinking. With these letter, I "get at," I mediate; the flow of what "is." At the very best I would/could achieve a kind of phenomenological verisimilitude with what "is." I do not thereby achieve a statement of reality that in any way represents laws of history, or laws of group behavior, or laws of leadership.

Nor are they such contemporary ghosts of the 19th century's "laws" as behavioral uniformities, or ideal-typical constructs, or parts of a series of cumulative "findings" that will one day lead to a perfect and final theoretical statement of the world.

Secondly, I do not aim at contributing to the knowledge of behavioral regularities, insofar as such regularities are understood to mean generalizations built up out of the objective observation of masses of individualized or discrete data. These are not the type of universals I am after in this study, though I recognize the validity of social science activity that is concerned about that; i.e., concerned about accumulating enough data over time so as to yield probabilities or likely trends in human behavior that may be said to fit a common human experience reaching across particular settings, cultures, states, and time.

I believe that such endeavor has a legitimate but fairly limited role in social science.

My study may at first glance be thought to be the opposite of that endeavor. The focus is on a particular locale in which I have identified for scrutiny four educational change programs, each of which is quite separate from the others. I would seem to be putting my emphasis on differentiation and qualitative exploration and not on what is common and quantitatively assimilable as regular patterns of behavior.

To a large degree this is true, but I have not thereby abandoned the pursuit of universals, or the pursuit of having something to generalize about. I feel that generalizing is a fundamental facet of doing social science. The universals I seek have to do with behavior, but they are not like the uniformities or regularities noted above. The universals in this study are attempts to state the major imperatives or constraints that occur in a social field in which people are making choices; to state likely tendencies of action given the presence or absence of certain key factors in that given social field or fields (e.g., rebellion, consciousness, strategy); and to state an overall theory of historical change as perhaps capable of being read into or derived from these major imperatives and these likely tendencies of action.

Thus, my findings about the microcosmic locale of mid-coast Maine are seen by me as suggesting, or manifesting, the structural-logic, or eco-logic, of change anywhere--that is, in other locales or even in larger systems.

Since it is both an assumption and a finding of this study that behavior occurs in structures, and since this is a factor in human behavior not very much taken into account by an older behavioral approach (the search for cross situational, cross cultural, "abstractly" valid behavioral regularities), therefore it may not be too much to say that the approach taken in this study is the more factual and realistic one. However, I feel there is validity in both approaches, and the endeavors of the one may help to correct the limitations of the other.

I think I may claim that the concepts, general conclusions and theory of social change I have phenomenologically derived are useful. They are useful to other social scientists, and to myself at a later time, in that they can be tested in other social laboratories and can be compared to other already existing conceptions of the change process. They are, in that sense, correctable.

They are also useful directly to the practitioner in that they may help clarify for him or her the nature of action and the consequences of alternative styles of leadership. This feedback of theory into practice is an important dimension of this kind of research. In addition, research of this kind may increasingly be seen as a valuable on-going tool for the practitioner in order for practice to gain maximum feedback for itself. It is at this level that social research could make its greatest contribution and impact, and directly help shape the flow of the historical process.

Thirdly, in my research I take pains to attribute to the objects of my study (the initiators, followers, operationalizers, critics, _et al._) the status of _subjects_. I assume that though they are objects of my inquiry and efforts to measure, they are and remain subjects, even as I attribute to myself in my activity as a researcher the status of subject. I assume no less for the objects of my inquiry than what I assume with respect to myself--that I am an active being subject to change.

This posture conditioned my research in basic ways. Instead of a picture in which there is a researcher _over here_ taking measurements and gathering data about an object of inquiry _over there_, instead of that, one has a picture of a researcher who is at all times himself a subject/object interacting both within himself(mulling over, sensitive to feedback), and with his social field, for the purpose of gathering and analyzing data. The social field is composed of sets of people each of whom is perceived as a subject/object.

I needed a way to bring into the foreground for my research perception, in as manageable a way as possible, the subject/object unities occurring in the social field. I needed to capture the actions of human beings in the transitive mode. There are other kinds of research; some typically emphatic about the need to engage with the subjectivities of human beings, their values and/or their feeling states; and others typically emphatic about the need to get on with objective data gathering and analyzing, whether of facts or of regularities of behavior. Both of these approaches are valid, within their respective limits, and yield their degree of social understanding; though the results are often marred by dichotomous, polemical disputes with "the other side;" vide normative versus behavioral polemics. My research intention is to go to neither side, but to take as a point of departure, and to preserve as much as possible, the subject/object unity, or dialectic, of human beings in the social field.

Understanding the nature of the perceptual situation is critical. Every perception is a phenomenological whole composed of a dual input--on the one hand, impressions, including images, coming from, arising out of, the social field (or given entity in the social field) under observation; and on the other hand the mind-focus, including the perceptual tools and processes, going out from the consciousness of the beholder. Every perception is thus simultaneously a statement about the observed and about the observer. Every perception is a partial "reading" of the situation under observation. To varying degrees the observed participates (consciously or unconsciously) in the formation of the perception. In the degree to which it so participates it becomes known more completely (hence the efficacy of a certain kind of interviewing--see below). Furthermore, a multiplicity of readings, of perceptual encounters, helps locate and identify the subject/object in its social field. A continuing dialog among these perceptual encounters, or readings, conducted in the mind of the observer and between him and other observers, yields a many-sided set of perspectives. These are gathered, mulled over; they are combined and compared with sets of perspectives regarding the other pertinent subject/object entities in the social field. All together, they work within the mind of the observer. He begins to derive and revise and again refine distinctions, categories, concepts, and, ultimately, generalizations.

This is the sort of work a researcher does, given this kind of phenomenological approach. The result is not a pure statement of the reality "out there" (mythically "out there") in the social field; nor is it a pure statement of the observer's subjectivity, equally mythically "in here." The result instead is a set of reasoned concepts, generalizations and conclusions derived from his (the observer's) interaction with a social field, and testable (i.e., correctable as well as verifiable) by anyone else able and willing to engage in a similar process of research--there or elsewhere.

Fourth, finding, viewing, human beings in a transitive mode is to look at them, and with them, in their activity as human beings in the world (i.e., not in laboratories, or in simulated games, or in specially designed experimental groups). Activity may reveal, may show forth (may show up) the relative unity and disunity of subject/object, and allow one to explore the complex of interwoven factors that move things in one direction or another.

Fifth, the concept of activity led me on to identify for closer examination events that happened or were happening in the program for change, events that contained and expressed a great deal of activity, and were regarded by the people involved as important, if not crucial in the evolution of the program. They could be large events, as the "year of the Pettit Board" in Freeport during which the entire school administration was ousted; or the firing of a popular teacher at Collins Brook School; or it could be a smaller event such as a town meeting debate in Freeport over adding a sum for a new reading program in the elementary schools; or the resignation of the principal at Jordan Acres School in Brunswick.

But, sixth, events occur in a context of forces that are moving, converging and relaxing, contracting and expanding. The context is a field of interactions (where apparent non-action may also be an action); it is a field or system of multiple feedback. I began to see that feedback is a critical element in the activity of human beings, within each person, and with others. It is a process that is already well validated in biology, and is coming to be more and more acknowledged for its importance in psychology (Kohler). Educational theory has identified this factor as an intimate part in the learning, growing process (Dewey). It has also been effectively applied by R. D. Laing to an analysis of the social field called the family. It may also, with good results in my estimation, be applied to the more general social and political field.

Thus, seventh, concepts of the subject/object dialectic, of activity, event, context, and feedback led me finally to postulate a concept of structure. Every relationship of one person with him or herself, or of two or more persons together is a structure. Every set of multiple relationships evoked in the common pursuit of an activity is a structure. Not everything that has an impact on relationships is within human control; these are conditions. But with respect to things that can be or are thought to be capable of being, shaped or modified or maintained or influenced in one way or another, human beings seek to control or be controlled, to act or be acted upon: they evolve a set of interactions. This set of interactions is a structure. It is composed of roles, of a certain ordering of these roles, of relationships, and of varied meanings that people have about these roles and relationships.

Human beings live "within" structures. They themselves on a daily basis, evoke, enact sets of structures. Laing has observed the relative invisibility of structures, such as in a family, to the people who form and are formed by the structures they enact. I found this confirmed again and again in this research study of people in and about their schools. Greater consciousness about structure may therefore be a key element in improving the process of social change.

Research Anatomy

My primary instrument was the interview. I interviewed approximately 140 people; most of the interviews were taped; most of them were about two hours each in length; and they were conducted over a period of two years (from the spring of 1972 to the summer of 1974). I interviewed several key people in each project several times, staggered over the two years.

The interviewees were school administrators, board members (past and present), teachers, parents, concerned citizens, union officials, and students. They were selected on the basis of their involvement in the projects I was studying, consistent with my being able to get a multifaceted set of perspectives regarding the project as a whole; regarding events within them; and regarding the structure of ongoing relationships.

A second instrument or tool of research was direct observation; much of it "direct contact," or participant observation. I helped in the schools: at Jordan Acres in Brunswick I helped on a regular basis every Tuesday in the Fifth grade from October through December, 1972, and for a full week in February, 1973, in Grades K through Four. I also did some observing in the Longfellow elementary school in Brunswick. During the summer of 1972 I attended, for one week, a special orientation and planning session for the new staff and principal of the Jordan Acres School.

At Soule School in Freeport I came and helped on various clusters of days during October through December, 1972, and then for a full week in late January, 1973, and returned again in December--January (1973-74).

At Collins Brook School I visited fairly often throughout the period of field research, helped on various days during the spring of 1972 and during October through December, 1972, and spent a full week there in early January, 1973. At Bowdoin's Upward Bound, I participated steadily in one of the regular classes during the summer of 1972, visited the other classes, ate lunch with the staff and students three days a week during that summer, participated in several evening group discussions, and observed one of the final evaluation sessions by the staff. I took notes of of my work as I went along.

In addition, for different periods of time, I had several research assistants, six students at Bowdoin College and a friend, in the community, active as a volunteer resource person in the area schools. They severally observed at Collins Brook School, Upward Bound, Jordan Acres, and Soule School. During the spring and fall semester in 1972 we had weekly meetings to share data and impressions and to discuss the evolution of the projects. The students wrote Independent Study papers on Collins Brook School, The Upward Bound Program, and the School Administration in Brunswick.

A third type of instrument for gathering data were questionnaires. Of these the important one evolved out of my interviews, observation, and further reading during the course of the research. I called the questionnaire (after I had tried it out on about a dozen people, including my student assistants) "Your Concept of Change" and sent it out to 105 people, all of whom I had already interviewed, in March, 1973. The questionnaire contained strong pro and con statements for each of twelve selected issues; examples of the issues are:

- move as swiftly and directly as you can in getting something new started; move more slowly and accommodatingly;
- respect past experience; don't be so impressed with "what has been done;"
- plan as much as you can in advance; make good general designs but build in a lot of room for the "unplanned;"
- strive for focus, direction and guidance in your teaching or your teachers' teaching; provide as many

options as possible and wait for the child to move;

- be primarily concerned with modifications of behavior; be primarily concerned with the "inner growth" of the person;
- recognize that effective leadership can only ultimately come from the top down; learn to look and strive for leadership that "wells up" from the bottom and emerges out of a developing situation.

Fifty-six people responded to the questionnaire and the distribution of returns was fairly general for the four programs. All of the key leaders in the programs were among the respondents.

Research Strategy

In addition to striving for as factual an understanding as possible of the birth, establishment, and sequential development of each of the programs studied, I also sought the following from my respondents. First, their sense of the program as a whole, of their part in it, and their estimate of other people's part in it; secondly, their sense of their own participation in, and estimate of, various events, whether large or small, that occurred in the evolution of the programs; thirdly, their perception of, and feeling about, the roles and relationships being enacted by the people in the program; and, finally, their beliefs about the learning process and about the scope and meaning of leadership in the program.

I relied first of all on getting as sharp a sense as I could of the respondent's standpoint, where he was "located," how things looked in terms of his experience of them; in what kind of psychic and perceptual space he was situated, both as subject and as object; and with what set of beliefs and concepts he habitually tended to order his world.

The interviews were of critical importance in this regard. It was important that they be treated and conducted as an action, or happening in itself. I sought a leisured and serious exchange between myself and the respondent, sometimes approaching an encounter in which the respondent would also ask me questions. I sought to respect the autonomy of the respondent, so that it was his world, and his movie of that world, that we were exploring. Thus, the form of the exchange was as important as the content. (cf. Edgar Morin's discussion of this kind of interviewing in the appendix to The Red and The White, Report From a French Village).

For that reason it was also important for me to transcribe the tapes myself--to listen for nuances, to go more carefully over critical passages and especially vital exchanges, and to compare my view of the interview when listening to the tape and taking down the words with my view of it at the time I did the interview. They were often different, sometimes subtly so.

Over time I obtained many multiple perspectives from a variety of people concerning the same event or set of events, or concerning a particular person or role. Most of the respondents were themselves actors in the events, though some of them were observers from "the outside." It became obvious to me how perspectival even "objective" viewers were. I believed my own objective view was clearer because, unlike them, I had deliberately and systematically sought to take the particular standpoints of a severality of actors engaged in situations and events; because I had access, to a greater degree than they, to the different roles, the different experiences, concepts and beliefs of all the important actors; and because I was myself over time constantly working out, in response to my respondents, my own standpoint and role, my own interpretation of what I saw, and my own concepts and beliefs concerning education and leadership. I strove for synthesis where I could, for balance, and toward a "mental feel" for the structure that was being enacted.

I sought factual information: what happened, as a matter of fact, trying to disengage it from the language used by actors and observers (*e.g.*, such and such a person was "fired"--but what in fact took place? Who did what? When did he do it? What were the others doing? When were they doing it? What messages were given, in what sequence? and so forth). I spent much time establishing the *sequence* of things happening, that this happened before that, and came to realize the difficulty people seem to have in knowing, and being able to recapitulate, the sequence.

I sought as much close detail as possible about certain decisions that seemed important to the program; not only what was decided, but who made the decision, and how were they made--both in the sense of the decision-making process, but in terms of the style of communication and the kind of relationship being enacted in coming to and making the decision.

I noted from my observation the style of people in a classroom, in stress situations, on the telephone, in their manner towards me and any changes in this over time.

I began to notice the importance of personnel changes and of role changes or re-definitions--these seemed to be bellwethers indicating shifts in the program in one direction or another.

I put emphasis on listening to typical words people used.to describe things; how words were being used; and what rhetoric seemed "in."

I noted silences about things, and either probed or left them alone, depending on whether I knew enough already, or whether I felt it to be impolitic or gratuitous to push harder in a certain direction.

I relied on the questionnaire "Your Concept of Change" to provide me with back-up information on how various key actors in the different programs saw themselves and what key ideas and beliefs animated them in their activity in the program.

Finally, I relied on taking several soundings of the same program over time: a spate of interviews of the same people, and/or different people in the same roles, done at different intervals: 3 times in Freeport in three successive years; similarly in Brunswick; and twice in successive years for Collins Brook School and Bowdoin Upward Bound.

Chapter Seven

The Political and The Educational: Demarcation and Relationship

A basic conceptual distinction, which underlies this study (and was discovered in the process of doing it), is on the one hand the political, understood primarily in terms of distributive activity, and on the other the educational, understood primarily in terms of growth activity.

I have indicated in the third chapter above how I came to make this distinction in the process of gathering and evaluating the data. I now want to explore the distinction further.

The political is activity that is oriented primarily towards problems of power distribution in the environment, towards arguments over what is fair, and towards arguments over what is perceived to be commonly needed by all members of an association of people. Political activity is present in all types of association: family, religious, economic, or educational. But in these latter types political activity is in essence subordinate to, or embedded in, the practice and realization of substantive social and personal aims. Political activity *per se* (*i.e.*, as a separate activity conducted by governments) has no such substantive social or personal aim--its aim is political activity itself, the expenditure of time and energy to resolve distributive questions relating to power constellations, claims of fairness and unfairness, and considerations of common need. This is what governments and other related political agencies (such as parties) are engaged in on a full-time, continuing basis. Every government that exists in the world is itself a limited statement of the answer to the question of fairness, and attempts to deal with conflict and the need for unity generally within the terms of that limited statement.

The educational is activity that is oriented towards the intellectual, moral and emotional maturation of human beings, on the part of all persons engaged in the activity, though primary emphasis is on the child. Such maturation, both as a process and as a result, is perceived differently by different people and gives rise to contrasting and conflicting conceptualizations of what growth is and how it may best be effectuated. Six such conceptualizations (or belief-styles) have been identified in this study. But the theme common to them all is growth, a term I prefer to maturation.

Further contrasts may be made that relate to the distributive/growth demarcation. Political behavior seems more interested in collectivities, forces, groups, or in people in general or in the abstract. Educational behavior is more interested in the individual and the consciousness of individuals.

Furthermore, the person in politics seems more highly sensitive to ego-image considerations--both those of himself or herself, but perhaps even more so, those of others. The actor in education by contrast seems to feel he has somewhat more room in which to "be himself"--or "herself." This is true even for those who do a bit of play-acting in the classroom, becoming "a character," throwing oneself into the role of "being different." This indicates that presumably one does not have to care all that much about what other people think.

This is related to the role of being concerned first and foremost about learning. Learning has that about it which suggests something intrinsically worthwhile as opposed to something extrinsic and instrumental.

Politics readily evokes the image of the "wheeler-dealer," one whose behavior seems underlined with calculations or anxieties about how this or that will help or hinder him or her in the delicate operations of building support, bringing about a coalition, for the sake of accomplishing this goal or easing this conflict (and enhancing one's reputation--which in turn is partly sought in order to gain more of the credibility vital to doing politics).

In this study I do not identify honor or glory as a compellingly unique dimension of political activity. The quest for glory--or ego-enhancement--seems to appear in some form or another in most if not all types of human activity. One may glory for example in the feeling that one has really done well at something that called forth the exercise of one's vital powers--in whatever field of endeavor. One may want recognition for this from others and glory in such acceptance or confirmation.

Yet, in politics the glory may be more image-oriented, more attuned to exchange values than to use values, more extrinsic than intrinsic. This may happen because of the central importance of distributive considerations and of the importance of correlative ego valuations as such. The sheer pressure of the political role and the gravitation of certain kinds of people to politics--these factors may enforce a high incidence of behavior that reflects a compulsive pursuit of "external" confirmation--whether from the people, or one's peers, or from history, or from God.

However that may be, I decided for the purpose of this study to regard the factor of honor or glory as a constant, as something manifestly human and bound to appear in some form or another in any human activity. I preferred to concentrate on something I believe to be more central, the demarcation between a distributive and a growth orientation.

Relationship

However, though demarcated, the political and the educational are also each present in the other. In politics there is present, in a subordinate way usually, an emphasis on growth; mutatis mutandis, in education there is, in varying and sometimes intense degrees, an emphasis on distributive concerns. In politics one not infrequently encounters behavior that aims less at distribution as such and aims as well (or more) at "educating" one's followers, or fence-sitters, or sometimes even the opposition--that is, in addition to persuading them to do this or that that you want done. Of modern presidencies, for example, it has not infrequently been remarked, that one of the occupant's many roles is as educator of the people. A favorite appellation given to Julius K. Nyerere, President of Tanzania, is Mwalimu, meaning teacher. One also often hears the phrase that such and such an American president "grew" while in office.

A "learning" process does take place in the hurly-burly of political affairs; but it takes place in a context and in an atmosphere that is primarily concerned about the nitty-gritty of power relationships and distributions. This tends to be true even in such highly ideological political systems as that of Communist China. This system, more than most, is consciously dedicated to the deployment of political action for the transformation of individual consciousness of the Chinese people--the effort being to move them from a traditional, and more latterly, a rationalistic mode of thinking and feeling towards a mode which in their rhetoric is labelled proletarian. To my way of thinking this immense, and awesome program of continuing cultural revolution in China represents more the "politicization of education" than it does the "educationalization of politics." Yet it does offer a massive illustration of the interpenetration of "education" and "politics."

But, if growth factors are present in politics, it is also, and perhaps even more true, that distributive considerations are present in education. I shall specify four ways in which this seems to be true.

First, education is political in the very minimal sense that educational structures exist territorially within the boundaries organized by a given government. The latter has a relative monopoly of the use of physical force within that territory; and all non-political structures are expected to observe the rules and regulations with respect to safe and peaceable conduct; and with respect to acceptable ways of distributing power and especially exercising authority. "Acceptable ways" tend to be those most favored by the more powerful elements in society and government. Such rules and regulations necessarily impinge on the external and internal relations of all educational structures, whether public or private.

Second, formal education, which is what this study is about, is conducted by and through organized groups, or institutions. These are organizations of differentiated roles in and through which decisions are made, communicated and acted upon. There is an exercise of power, which in stable systems is most often manifested in authorized commands with which there is willing compliance. Even in stable systems, however, there seems to be not always a clear and clean fit among role, authorized command, and willing compliance. That is, power elements intervene which the system has to deal with or live with, in some way. It either adjusts them to the existing authorized power relationships. Or it expels them as intractable and undigestible. Or it adjusts to them, in which case there is a change in the authorized power relationships. Thus, any structure is in this sense and in itself political, whether a family, or a church or a school.

Third, as already noted, people have different concepts of growth, leading not infrequently to conflict. This conflict affects definition of roles, levels of compliance, and notions of what is and is not an authorized exercise of power. Perceptions of what others are doing, and why they are doing it, tend to cloud up under such conditions; offensive and defensive behavior tends to increase. "Personality conflicts" increase and existing ones are exacerbated. What Laing in Politics of the Family describes as happening in a family, is also what happens in a school, on the order of "he thought that she thought that he thought," and so forth, escalating to almost infinite patterns of interactive complexity. In such a situation, the distributive mode of behavior increases, and is indeed needed more and more, to a point where it may overshadow growth concerns.

Fourth, the school describes a relationship between adults and children: big people (grownups) and small people (the kids). Though the "reason" why they are brought together is growth (preferably for both) yet the structure of their relationship is inherently one of inequality. There is the possibility of "ego-competition" and more generally of conflict over role definition, over assumptions of motivation and intention, over getting the right kind or degree of validation (grades, credits, etc.). All these and more are imbedded in the structure of the relationship. It may be said to be one of the most painfully political types of relationships in society, and not least because it "ain't supposed to be that way" according to the mythology of the prevailing culture. At least in the family it is possible to scream and to a degree to find some legitimacy for this, but this isn't regarded as acceptable behavior in the classroom. In this particular study I found very little direct effort to pierce the balloon of public self-deception on this question, with the exception of Collins Brook School.

Fifth, there is seen to be in growth itself (in the act or activity of growth) a distributive element. The person educating has the opportunity to assess, however consciously or however intuitionally, where the person being educated is "at" psychologically, intellectually and culturally: what value systems, for example, what authority assumptions, etc., are exhibited there. The teacher may then strive to find ways (words, acts, silences which are also acts, sequential sets of challenges in a line from less to more difficult, gestures of patience, impatience, approval, disapproval) all calculated in as timely a manner as possible to evoke a response in the person being educated that would or could move him or her forward towards acquiring a skill, or achieving an insight, or developing a theoretical understanding. Though there may be ever so much mutuality in this, or ever so much unthinking willing response to prearranged (pre-ordained) structures on the part of both teacher and student, yet the behavior is not without elements of calculation. The calculation constitute manipulations to a degree because they are efforts to move the other person forward (or have him move himself forward) in a direction and across terrain that he sees, perceives but dimly, and with such dimness of vision often (because of fear, born of ignorance; or self-despair; or anger at "authority") that he is not very sure he wants really to move in that or in any direction.

Distributive action comes into play here, taking many forms, whether brusque, direct and lion-like; or supple, indirect and fox-like--whichever seems most to suit the style of the educator, the needs of the situation, and the bringing into being of movement on the part of the person being educated. Distributive action is here seen as serving the purpose of growth, but that does not make it less distributive nor any less an integral part of the learning process.

On the other hand, from the point of view of the person-being-educated, there are correlative considerations which evoke distributive modes of behavior. One tests the educator, often to the point of resisting. One compares one educator to another because one is testing to discover where and in what direction you want to go; or whether you wish not to be bothered at all (in which case you can decide to go along with what then is perceived as "the mickey mouse," or you can overtly drop out, become "difficult"). If, however, your probing and testing out seems to be getting you somewhere, you "latch on" to the educator, you adapt yourself, you try out his or her style, you ask their kind of questions for a while and so forth. And all of these are modes of behavior that at one and the same time are distributive when looked at in one sense, from one angle, and profoundly learning when looked at in another sense, from another angle. Though, again, the distributive serves the purposes of growth.

Given this phenomenon in the world of education, one might ask if the world of politics also exhibits behavior in which growth and distributive factors are integrally related --that is, where considerations of growth so enter into the calculations of political beings that acts which may look like manipulations might just as well also be seen as acts which generate growth. This is conceivable and probable, but my study does not include the world of politics as such. Therefore I feel able only to posit this as a possibility and as a very suitable topic for further research.

However, my study does show examples of people in leadership positions in the world of education, acting in a politically distributive way, reaching out towards people in another camp in a manner that suggests trying to generate a learning movement in that camp--to a point where it is not easy to classify the behavior as definitely political or educational.

This suggests to my mind, conceptually, an area of behavior where growth and distributive factors are inextricably related, where opposites seem to find a kind of unity in action.

One may diagram this as follows:

The opposite tendencies or forces are towards a distributive emphasis and towards a growth emphasis. One may label these tendencies as moving respectively to the distributive pole and the growth pole.

As one moves on an arc from the distributive pole towards the center, the cross-hatched area may be labelled growth--the dominant theme being distributiveness. The growth emphasis gradually increases in relation to the dominant theme until one reaches the center, or intermediate point beyond which lies the realm of the educational. This point is somewhat like a continental divide where up to a certain point the streams are running in one direction and after which they run in the opposite direction.

As one moves on an arc from the growth pole towards the center the wavy lines may be labelled distributiveness--the dominant theme being growth. Distributive concerns gradually increase until one reaches the intermediate point, beyond which lies the realm of the political.

A key variable in the relation of growth and distributiveness is a phenomenon that I have named the transformational symbol. This symbol may be a word or a manner of speaking or something as innocent as a particular kind of gesture, or even something far heavier like an elaborate argument, or again something as light as a bit of theater or something as complete as a person.

The transformation involved is taking a feeling or a perception or a concept from the context (or structure or mind set) in which it has been generated and within which it "belongs" (a bit of perceived facticity whose facticity is relative to the sub-system in which it moves) and communicating that feeling or perception or concept in such a manner that it can be translated with sufficient authenticity into the "language" of a different (perhaps even conflicting) context or structure or mind set. It is received there, not in the sense, that it is accepted without question, though this may happen, but that it is seen as something to be taken into account, as something to be learned and integrated, in which case there is some growth involved. Or it may be received as something needing to be handled distributively in a new way. Or both of these responses can take place. The work of Claude Levi Straus and his many followers offer numerous illustrations and a convincing epistemological basis for concepts on the order of transformational symbol.

It is like taking a word from one culture, part of a given language, and trying to translate it into another culture in another language so that it may evoke in the latter a set of feelings and understandings not the same as in the original culture but a way of feeling and thinking about similar things that can lead to a deeper awareness and to greater communication with that culture.

Or, it is like what T. S. Eliot called the "objective correlative," a word or image which--in a world given over to the fragmentation and discontinuity of culture--could mediate meanings born in one context (in which the poet worked) to other contexts in which other poets, and readers of poetry, worked.

It seems from the present study that in situations of conflict and change the successful use of transformational symbols requires a prior awareness of the efficacy and need for such symbols--as a safeguard against the eruption of polarizing symbols among forces you wish to see united, or at least not at loggerheads with one another.

This discussion of transformational symbols anticipates part of the analysis made in those sections below dealing with the style and strategy of educational leaders. I bring the discussion here to an end by concluding that transformational symbols can be primarily educational (learning devices) or primarily political (cooptative devices). Yet either way, something of both takes place--something partly distributive and partly learning. Hence one often perceives that the intention of an actor in history, being political and employing to that end what transformational devices he had to that end, produced the "unintended effect" of a change in consciousness on the part of those he sought to co-opt. And, by the same token one may often perceive an educator in action, employing a bit of transformational symbolism to further the learning process, producing the "unintended effect" of a shift in a given balance of power.

A last point concerning the inter-relationship of politics and education may be made, one which balances to a degree the emphasis on transformational symbols. This concerns the fact that, as noted earlier in this chapter, educational institutions are organizations in which power is distributed in an authorized way. Effecting change, let us say effecting a movement from one belief-style to another, can often not take place unless there is also a break in the established pattern of organizing and exercising power. That is, the deployment of transformational symbols (which relates to changes in people's consciousness of sufficient depth to bring about the acceptance of a new concept) is not sufficient; a change in the structuring of power is also necessary. On the other hand a change in the structuring of power without some correlative change in consciousness is also insufficient. Examples of both are illustrated in this study.

PART II

NINE SETS OF FACTORS THAT INTERACT IN THE PROCESS OF SOCIAL CHANGE

Chapter One

Dualities-in-Conflict, or Cultural Discontinuity

In Part I I made it an assumption of this study, and one confirmed by this study, that human beings in pursuit of a species activity, such as education, necessarily enact structures. Structure includes at least three separable, though not separate, elements. They are, first, the creating and ordering of roles in a certain way; second, the interplay of relationships among the people in these roles who are in pursuit of the activity; and third, the expression of a variety (often a contrariety) of meanings accorded to roles and relationships and the activity being pursued. People engaging in an activity do this on a daily basis, enacting and re-enacting structures, changing over time, trying to survive and grow.

A given structure is thus by no means monolithic. It may be more or less in a state of conflict; and at the same time more or less in a state of integration.[1] This applies

---

[1] For a lucid treatment of conflict and integration in a polity, and by extension in any system or subsystem, see Michael Duverger, The Idea of Politics, Chicago, 1964. Another interesting treatment of this question (interesting in that it represents a change of mind, and in my estimation thus a breakthrough) is provided by S. N. Eisenstadt, (continued to p. 72)

to micro-systems as well as to macro-systems. Thus in the carrying on of a given activity, where we find people interacting with one another through common organized networks, we also tend to find a degree of heterogeneity and differentiation, more or less consciously perceived and acted upon by the people in these networks. This differentiation may be, and is often expressed by traditional social science as a plurality of interests. But from this study it seems more accurate and realistic to describe this differentiation as sets of dualities, each one in a state of potential or actual conflict.

Critical dualities include sex, class, racial and ethnic, and age differences. They also include authority roles; territorial identification expressed as native, or "us in here," *versus* outsiders; and skill performance criteria, often expressed as precision *versus* generality or expert *versus* lay judgment. Less visible, but deeply embedded in the structure of human experience nevertheless, is personal identity (*i.e.*, me/not me).

The challenge of change, and the challenge of counter change, bring out or make manifest the dualities of actual or potential conflict. What tends to result is a condition of relative discontinuity. People's perceptions, filtered

---

(cont. from p. 71) *Tradition, Change, and Modernity*, Wiley-Interscience, N. Y., 1973. Eisenstadt now argues, in contrast to his earlier more uniform "Parsonian" beliefs, that social systems, and sub-systems, are not usually organized in one unitary system, but consist of often conflicting and antagonistic segments, reacting in different ways to the challenge of the new.

through the perspectives afforded them by their particular and limited position or situation in the total complex of structural activity, tend to reflect that situation. Differences thus are readily perceived in a more heightened way. There is a tendency to translate objectively perceived differences, which previously may have been noticed but either accepted or located in the background of consciousness, into subjectively experienced discontinuities. Duality merges into conflict and may exacerbate into polarity. Such experience triggers and deepens a sense of antagonism. Not all dualities come into play at once. Usually two or three felt discontinuities seem to predominate in a conflict at a time and others remain latent or play a minor though nevertheless supporting role. When groups of people begin to experience the same set of contradictions (e.g., old vs. young, established authority patterns vs. perceived threats to them, middle and working people vs. the "aristocracy," native vs. newcomer) then they tend to "find" each other and coalesce for and against the challenge of the new.

The "new" may initially take the form of a technological change or the incursion of a new set of ideas or a movement of population. That is, a so-called "exogenous" force may intervene in a given structure, overturn older balances and produce a heightening of tensions to the point of conflict, revolt and counter revolt. I put quotes around the word "exogenous" because the word may connote something external to the structure acting upon the structure as if from the "outside." That would be misleading since at the moment a factor impinges on a set of relationships it is in a state of interaction with that set and becomes part of the structure and part of a continuous feedback process. In practice, the "exogenous factor" may team up with hitherto untapped or unexpressed energy which the incursion of the new factor may have triggered by upsetting the balances of the established structure.

Freeport

Freeport, Maine, in the early sixties was a semi-rural, semi-mill town (leather industries) of about 4,000 people; though it also included a "labor aristocracy" employed at L. L. Bean's factory and store; a wealthier professionally oriented citizenry generally associated with South Freeport; and a small number of very wealthy business-related families, many of whom were part time residents and in any case took no direct interest in education, their children being enrolled in private schools. There was a history of relative un-ease, and "iffy" toleration of one another between mainstream native stock in Freeport (generally middle income) and the more affluent and/or more educated folk in South Freeport.

During the later sixties and early seventies there was a substantial influx of newcomers largely from out of state, largely people with professional or technical occupations, largely affluent (by comparison with the average native), with urban and suburban backgrounds. Though they came to live in Freeport, their jobs tended to be in and around the greater Portland area. The population increased from 4,055 in 1960 to about 5,300 by 1974; the housing units increased spectacularly from 600 in 1960 to about 1600 in 1974.[2]

In the elections for school board in 1968 and 1969 three "liberals" (all Republicans)[3] were added to the Board. They won over to their persuasion one other of the five-member board who had been identified as a conservative. The fifth, an L. L. Bean employee, though first sympathetic to their cause, later withdrew from the board in protest against their actions. The four of them began pushing hard for change in the schools in 1969/70. In the process they gained the enmity of the school administrators, the great majority of teachers, the newly emerging teachers union, and the overwhelming majority of the townspeople, especially the native stock. The latter came to view the Board as composed of "South Freeporters" and as part of the crowd of newcomers or "outsiders," even though two of the four did not reside in South Freeport, and three of the four had long standing roots in the community.

There was a series of confrontations in the winter and spring of 1970, including numerous mass meetings, a near teachers' strike, and a boycott of the schools by the aroused parents that was aimed at the Board. The now embattled four on the School Board, under the strong leadership of Marion F. ("Pic") Pettit, decided to stand their ground. Gradually evolving a strategy, they encouraged and accepted resignations by all of the chief administrators in the school system, including--decisively--a popular traditionally-oriented elementary supervisor. They then "brought their own team in," as one of their opponents put it, all of them "outsiders" and committed to change. They continued to press this new group of administrators to inaugurate change during the next two years. In March, 1972, they finally lost a majority on the School Board to people either sympathetic to, or dedicated to, the cause of their opponents.

---

[2] Figures provided by the Freeport Town Manager in an interview in January, 1974.

[3] At that time candidates for School Board still ran on a party label.

It was a combination of "exogenous" and "endemic" elements that evoked a change in the prevailing situation in Freeport and in turn brought out the latent discontinuities in the prevailing educational structure of relationships and networks. Of the dualities noted above, the factors of territory, age, authority role, social class role, and personal identity came sharply into play. The teachers, administrators and parents all felt threatened in their authority role and their identity respectively in the classroom, school office and home. In addition these same groups could side with the militant teachers union leaders on the issue of their "common" status vis-à-vis the South Freeport "snobs" and on the issue of territorial identificaion (native vs. newcomer). The generational gap tended also to be felt in the same way by all four groups since a major issue raised by the Pettit Board was the failure of the school system to treat children with sufficient respect or concern. Thus such "normal" dichotomies (that otherwise tend to appear in school struggles) as the seesaw battle between the taxpaying citizen and the teachers union in quest of higher pay was blurred and suppressed in favor of a united front against what was perceived as a greater threat.

Brunswick

Brunswick is a town of about 16,000 people. It is a fairly thriving commercial, banking and shopping center with some manufacturing industry (shoes, shipbuilding, contracting, printing), a prestigious liberal arts college (employing 450), and a sizeable naval air station (employing 620).[4]

Major groups in the town are business and professional people; college professionals; a substantial white collar stratum; a blue collar work force which is heavily made up of Franco-Americans[5] (concentrated residentially near the center of town on the "wrong side of the tracks"); a substantial "old Yankee" culture whose members tend to live out on the fringes of town; a not insignificant number of youth groups and gangs; a large number of senior citizens who make up over 10% of the population[6]; and, finally, a not inconsiderable number of poor people, many of whom are thrust up against the fences of the naval air station in an area often referred to as Moodyville, after the man who owns most of the houses.

---

[4] The Times Record, Brunswick, Maine, Jan. 31, 1975, p. 12.

[5] According to the 1970 census, 2,488 residents cited French as their mother tongue. The actual number of those stemming originally from a French or Franco-American culture is probably substantially higher.

Pressures came from several sources. Taxpayers rebelled against high property taxes and at one point voted a $100,000 cut in the school budget. This movement was led by a Franco-American leader and had the support of Franco-Americans, senior citizens and of middle-income citizens generally. There was also a strong feeling of concern among these groups for what they felt was a breakdown of discipline in the schools; and they were restive over long hair and drugs and anti-Vietnam War protesting.

A second type of pressure came from young people who wanted long hair and drugs and an end to the Vietnam War, and who were rebelling against what they regarded as the "mickey mouse" type of discipline and irrelevant studies in the schools. A massive confrontation occurred on the town mall in the summer of 1970, over recently passed regulations restricting freedom on the mall, between the police and the youth, this resulting in many arrests and a bitter feeling toward the Town Council.

---

6. According to the 1970 census, 1,693 citizens were over the age of 62.

A third type of pressure came from liberal educators in the school system and liberal parents. They were unhappy over what they regarded as authoritarian attitudes and behavior on the part of school administrators, especially the superintendent; and they felt a need to move the school system towards a less "structured," a less traditional type of education, towards a more open concept of education, of a kind that they felt was being introduced elsewhere, for example, in the Boston suburbs.

A fourth type of pressure was the growing organizational power and demands of the teachers through the Brunswick Teachers Association, backed up, as in Freeport, by a newly militant Maine Teachers Association. They wanted better pay and better professional opportunity and better status.

A fifth type of pressure stemmed from a general class feeling, represented especially by some Franco-American and Old Yankee leaders, towards what they regarded as the established and ruling groups--the college and business-related people. There were strong feelings of mistrust and of reaction against the tendency of the establishment to "run everything" in their estimation, leaving other groups as second-class citizens. The more militant among these leaders sought in late 1970 to change the method of election to the School Board from at-large to particular districts. The intention was to increase the opportunity for the "non-establishment" classes to get representation on the Board. The effort was defeated.

A sixth pressure was the school administration itself: the Superintendent, the Assistant Superintendent, the Elementary Supervisor and the principals of the high school, the junior high (or middle) school, and the three elementary schools. They felt themselves to be vertically exposed on all sides to the pressures already identified; and, even aside from their own personal beliefs in "a tight ship," in administrative efficiency, in the hierarchy of command, and in the ethic of professional neutrality, they inherited an administrative tradition that strongly emphasized the same values. This was especially true of the superintendency which had been used to running things,within of course the very broad policy orientations provided from time to time by the School Board. But this was changing. In response to demands raised by teachers, successive School Boards began to raise more particular questions of a policy nature with respect to quality of teaching and the costs of education. This increased the atmosphere of pressure under which the administration labored and increased as well their tendency to emphasize the values of administrative expertise, efficient organization, hierarchy and professional authority.

A seventh, and final, pressure was the shortage of space in the schools. The Superintendent, who was used to getting his own way, pushed for a plan to expand the Coffin Elementary School by adding on ten cubical classrooms. This plan was defeated in a tumultuous town meeting after it had gained the approval of the School Board. The people leading the fight to defeat the necessary bond issue were drawn mainly from the liberal educators and parents. They were led by an educator, herself the Coffin School Principal and up to that time a close and loyal friend of the Superintendent, and later to become a member of the School Board. She spoke out against the Coffin expansion proposal as "makeshift and narrow-sighted." The liberal parents and educators saw this need for expansion as an opportunity to develop, via a new building altogether, in a new more open-classroom direction. They also saw it as a pilot project--as a way of gradually bringing over the rest of the system as well to more open concepts.

As a result of this defeat, a new study committee was formed by the School Board under the chairmanship of a local liberal educator who was the director of educational innovation programs in mid-coast Maine for Educational Development Center, Inc., of Newton, Mass. In addition, the elections in December, 1969, resulted in a four to one majority for liberal representatives of the business, professional and college constituencies. This new Board hired a new superintendent in the summer of 1970, one committed to team teaching, differentiated staffing, better teacher evaluation, sequential learning units, and similar innovations. The same Board beat off efforts by anti-establishment forces, already noted, to establish separate school electoral districts. The reports from the study committee recommending the construction of a new, physically open type of school at Jordan Acres were accepted and implemented. The new school opened in September, 1972, though only after it had been presented to the town by the school administration and Board as a very modest departure, in a more flexible direction. Words such as "open" or "experimental" to say nothing of "free" were carefully excised.

To sum up. The many crosscurrents converging on the school administration are a function of the many social groups in town, each of which seems cut off from others and isolated within their own values, interests and outlooks. When pressures for change occur, the discontinuities reveal themselves. Dualities transform themselves into tensions and polarities: expert _versus_ laymen; taxpayer _versus_ teacher; old _versus_ young; the child-centered _versus_ the disciplinarian; Franco-American _versus_ Wasp; class conflict; identity conflict. Many of these overlapped in Brunswick, though not to the degree they did in the height of the Freeport crisis. The result was a continuing swirling of crosscurrents in which and because of which the practical decisions of the administrator tended in the direction of holding the ship steady; or cautiously stroking forward; or of deftly operationalizing things in the hope of maneuvering past obstacles as in the night, instead of having a more forthright encounter and exchange as in the day.

But it would be a mistake to be satisfied with this as a full explanation for the active (and inherited) spirit of "administrative finesse" that seems to prevail in Brunswick. Other factors need to be brought in, especially the nature and quality of the rebellion on the part of the liberal change seekers, their consciousness, and their belief-styles.

Collins Brook School (CBS)

Once the free school was launched in the fall of 1969, discontinuities began to appear, some of them quite severe. One might have thought that a new venture could avoid the conflicts and obstacles to unity and fulfillment of aims encountered in an embedded social system such as in Freeport or Brunswick. Not so. Though there may be a sense in which the problems, being less fixed in the received institutional structure, are thereby relatively less intractable, nevertheless the experience of CBS, and those of other free schools either observed or read about, reveals the degree to which a new venture is exposed to many of the same kind of actual or potential discontinuities suffered by established systems. Some indeed are more intense, precisely because expectations are greater, including the expectation that here in this new venture there is "at last" the opportunity to get away from the "mickey mouse" and hassles of "the system."

A great expectation is being able to be yourself. It is discovered that this is not easy, especially when others are encountered trying to achieve the same thing. Problems of your own identity come quickly into view; one may act out angers and hostilities you were only dimly aware of before; it is a matter of working out a new or renewed sense of self and a correlative sense of limits in relationship to others. This may take a long time. This personal identity conflict or discontinuity is much more in evidence in a free school than in established systems, and constitutes a major difference in the kind of conflict typically encountered there.

Another expectation is greater freedom in roles and, even, freedom from roles altogether. Role definitions--attempts to arrive at them, and attempts to escape them--became a continuing challenge and a source of conflict: parent/teacher; administrator/parent; administrator/staff; administrator/students; visitors/residents; teacher/child; non-teaching staff/teaching staff; older kids/middle kids; older kids/younger kids; younger kids/middle kids; day kids/boarding kids; day parents/older kids; and so forth. Much of this role definition turned on questions of authority and responsibility. Partly it also turned on a tension over skill performance: whether to emphasize a more precise or a more general set of criteria, a more expert approach or a more lay-style, amateur, approach. Partly it also turned on sex roles and sexual behavior. This became more pronounced as time went on, and produced a major crisis for the school in its third year, though the sexual factor was very closely tied in with role definition and the problem of authority. This will be taken up below.

Upward Bound

This program for teenagers from Maine's northern counties at Bowdoin is six-week in-residence at the College during the summer plus follow-up work during the winter, both at Bowdoin and in their home areas. The program evoked a complex of dualities-in-conflict: identity conflicts within the students; conflict between Bowdoin College administration and the program leaders over life style and behavior of students; between the "Ivy League" professors teaching in the College and "raw kids" from Maine's poorest counties; between the students going back to their up-country high schools after a summer of Upward Bound and their high school administrations, and not infrequently, their parents; between the leader of the program and the staff, especially the administrative staff; and between first-year students and those returning students who were cast in semi-administrative staff roles (called Bridge students to describe their anticipation of moving on to college).

We see here that there was conflict over authority roles; differences in class orientation; conflict within the students, and often the staff, expressed as "identity" crises; some division on account of ethnic origin, a substantial number of students coming from Franco-American homes; and some conflict over expert versus lay skill performance.

Launching these four change movements and programs "brought out" dualities (with potential for conflict) embedded in the stuff of the human and physical environment. Some were and could have been foreseen. Others were not. It is doubtful if anything short of cosmic, or divine, pre-vision could have enabled the innovators to foresee the nature and/or the intensity of all of them. It would seem therefore part of good planning for change to "build in" provisions for the discovery-through-practice of unknown or dimly known dualities and to "build in" sensitivity and capability in responding to them when they are discovered, or un-covered. Of particular importance is a built-in awareness, in advance, of the problem of leadership in a change program. Of the cases above, it is the authority role with its potential for conflict that is most common to all four. It is the one that seemed least accessible to the foresight and imagination of the innovators, and yet problems evoked by the authority role of the leaders were fundamental to the way in which the program evolved. The discussion here points to such factors as consciousness and strategy, to be taken up below.

Chapter Two

Rebellion or The Roots of Consciousness: Defiance, Emulation, and New Values

The previous chapter developed the notion that within any structure over time there subsist a series of dualities. These dualities tend to be in a state of potential or actual conflict even though the structure continues to function on a more or less smooth path. Elements of newness are self-introduced into the structure. These may be physical or psychic elements or both. They may be technological or ideational elements or both. A new awareness may be triggered in the flow of interactions that constitute the structure. Or--a related phenomenon--there may be a new eruption of energy occurring at any point within the structure.

To these elements of newness the prevailing structure responds. It may respond in a variety of ways. It seems a tendency of structures that endure over time to adapt and bend not easily and/or to do so at a pace too slow to match the demands of the new elements. First, it often happens that the structure responds defensively and tightens up. This can, like a dam in a river, increase the demand or pressure for change even while bottling it up. Or, secondly, the structure may seek to "buy off" the demands and in this way try to maintain itself essentially in its established ways. Or, third, the structure may "allow itself" to be moved by the new elements, digest them, and be basically changed in the process.

In any case however, though especially in the first two cases, the social agents of the new elements undergo an experience of rebellion. They discover to themselves that things are not "right," whether with themselves or the world, or both. There seems a lack of fit or fitness in the way things are organized. Things could be better, probably a lot better. This gives birth to the deeply felt notion that things should be better. Initially this may mean turning-on-self or turning on friends in fits of unexplained frustration, anger, hostility. But whether or not there is this interval there occurs a moment when the "problem which had no name" gets more defined and the social agent-to-be begins to identify what it is he or she is opposed to. The "enemy" takes shape, generally a typical figure or group or class or abstraction (e.g., "the system," or the prevailing ideology) that is seen to occupy a position of ruling force within the structure and is perceived either as doing nothing about a bad situation or as deliberately perpetuating that situation. This is a moment of defiance when the sense of felt injustice is very strong and the image of the enemy is sharply and simply etched in the agent's rising awareness. It is also the moment when the undertow of personal hurt and disgust is both most abrasively felt and most disguised--kept from the agent's own awareness--in the form of general principles, objective and universalistic assertions about justice and about the need to rid the world of the enemy.

Defiance is double edged. It reflects a state of self-conflict. On the one hand there is a felt need--however unclearly understood or articulated at this stage--to find, to arrive at, a better world in which a better pattern of human activity and relationships will exist. This includes anger at the identified enemy for seeming to profit from existing injustice and for not moving to correct it.

On the other hand there is ambivalence towards the enemy. There is a strong feeling of anti-, a desire to destroy him or it, coupled with jealousy and envy, an unresolved desire to be like "the enemy" and to enjoy the position and privileges of "the enemy."

Rebellion may thus express itself initially in *reactive* ways. For example Camus[1] and Fanon[2] show that in the initial thrust of the oppressed one for freedom, he aims at toppling the oppressor--to get rid of him altogether as the hated enemy. This reaction may include a desire to emulate what the oppressor is or does. One "surreptitiously" admires what one also resists and resents. One may succeed in removing the oppressor, or one may succeed in "joining" him. In either case one may wind up taking over, or vaulting up into, the position and privileges of the oppressor and behave towards others as that oppressor behaved towards you.

---

[1] Albert Camus, *The Rebel; an Essay on Man in Revolt* with a foreword by Sir Herbert Read. A revised and complete translation by Anthony Bower. New York, Knopf, 1957.

[2] Franz Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth*, preface by Jean Paul Sartre, translated by Constance Farrington, N. Y., Grove Press, 1966.

There is open another possibility. Defiance may sustain its original impulse to overcome the perceived form of oppression altogether. The distinction between overcoming oppression and of only reacting against oppression grows clearer. Here emulation is now clearly comprehended, and though elements of emulation are accepted they are absorbed into a deeper movement of consciousness. This deeper movement is in the direction of a new value. It is expressed as the desire for something better--better than the existing structures of relationships and the existing paradigms of human exchange.

This is the third phase in rebellion--beyond defiance and emulation, though retaining elements of each. It may be called the transformational phase of rebellion, its culmination and fulfillment. Or, again, it may be called the prophetic element in rebellion. It may augur the coming into being of a new value, either through an evolutionary or revolutionary change in existing structures. Whether it is one or the other depends (a) on the strategy of the social agents, (b) the response of the existing structure and (c) on general conditions.

The phenomenon of rebellion played a strong role in each of the four projects. It was most dramatically in evidence in Freeport, but there were also clear manifestations in the other three as well. Two "enemies" in particular were common to social agents in all four projects: established paternalistic patterns of authority and what was perceived as authoritarian behavior; and the traditional mode of education (described in the next chapter).

Freeport

The four members who formed a coalition on the School Committee under the leadership of the chairman Pic Pettit, were in a mounting state of revolt and defiance during 1969-70. In the summer and fall of 1969 they sought dialog on problems and possible changes in the schools with students, administrators, teachers, and interested citizens. They sponsored public meetings at which pros and cons, especially of the prevailing teaching system, were aired and alternatives were brought up. They came to an agreement with the Teachers' Association (FTA) whereby the latter would study the tracking system and make a report. They backed off tactfully from a confrontation with the athletic department (and the superintendent)over what they felt to be the overly picayunish attitude towards dress codes and the wearing of appropriate clothing at gym, including jock straps. They did, however, begin to move against individual teachers whom they felt were "down on kids" and thereby came into loggerheads with a rejuvenated and well-led teachers association determined to defend the rights of teachers.

Salary talks in late fall, early winter proved difficult and soured the Republican minded board on what they regarded as union tactics by the teachers. They contrasted in their minds the energy on the part of the FTA in pushing for more money with what seemed to them to be their lethargy in improving the quality of instruction and in looking for alternatives to existing patterns and practices.

By January 1970 they were fed up. They publicly attacked a hastily put together report on grouping (tracking) by the FTA. They ordered the superintendent to deal directly with a strongly entrenched math teacher in the high school. Their objection to her was that she was overly academic, that she reached only the bright, college-bound kids, and consequently that she prevented the great majority from receiving the benefit of adequate math instruction. And they caused to be distributed to all the teachers, and to the press, a strongly worded letter by a known social friend, the wife of a banker, which charged that the Freeport school system was slowly but surely strangling the children.

These actions, especially the last one, produced an uproar that grew in intensity during the next several months. The Board was under attack from virtually all quarters and feelings ran high. The actions of the Board provoked militant responses from the more solidly established and powerful teachers; from the administrators, and from their large network of friends and supporters among the townspeople. The majority of the latter began to see the Pettit Board as South Freeport snobs who were putting down the town and school system and were ruining discipline, lowering standards academically and lowering standards of obedience to authority.

Public meetings of several hundred citizens were common. An effort at recall of the Board proved abortive when it was ruled unconstitutional. There was a near teachers' strike in early May and an injunction sought and won by the Board against the FTA. There was a boycott of the schools by the parents, directed against the Board.

In all this the Board dug in its heels. It refused to meet in public with anyone, pleading the need to work out in private an agreement with the teachers on a new basic contract. They now aimed at replacing the administrators. The high school principal had already resigned in January. The Superintendent announced his resignation in March. The principal of the middle school announced his resignation in April. This left only the Elementary Supervisor among the major administrative positions. He was popular in the town and trusted as a good educator. The Board decided to press him to resign and drew up a set of criticisms. After a tumultuous meeting in which hundreds of citizens milled around the locked doors of the hearing room in early June, the Board withdrew its charges. The elementary supervisor, however, resigned in July, and this left the way open for the Board to bring in "a wholly new team" of administrators. By this time also some "thaw" in the strained relations with the town had occurred. The moderates among the latter were deciding to go along with the Pettit Board at least for the time being.

To sum up: The Pettit Board's rebellion during this halcyon year was fed by an increasing and overlapping series of frustrations with those teachers at all levels who seemed to have little if any degree of involvement with the children they were teaching (this was also strongly felt by each one on behalf of their own children in the schools); with teachers who seemed to teach in a way that favored only the apparently bright kids and left in the lurch kids from less advantaged homes or kids with learning and emotional problems; with the prevailing system of tracking; with behavior in teachers and administrators that seemed "purely administrative" and traditionally paternalistic; with "impositions" on kids "from above" generally; with the poor performance of the system as seen in the large number of drop-outs (30% in the High School was their estimate), in the small number going on to college, and in the poor reading levels in the elementary grades felt as a fact by them but not yet tested; with the traditional operational definition of their role as board members which they felt condemned them to a maintenance orientation approach ("paying the oil bill") and kept them out of school policy; with the "unionism" of the newly powerful teachers association which they regarded as overly emphatic about wages and hours and irresponsible concerning the quality of teaching; and, to put a cap on their frustration and rising impatience, with the seeming lethargy of too many people in the system and the seeming dogged resistance of the system to their probings and pressures.

The situation was greatly complicated by the growing rebellion of the teachers against their traditional second class status. This was gaining momentum at the same time, and independently of the Pettit Board. The association found new, energetic, leaders. With the help of a strong state teachers' organization, these leaders were making the FTA a cohesive force. They saw the association as a way for them to win, not only more money but a long sought professional status.

Their rebellion and that of the Pettit Board might have run in parallel lines but those lines were crossed. Confrontation and polarization ensued. It occurred mainly over the meaning of authority and over the appropriate relations between teacher and child.

The attitudes of the Pettit Board and their supporters, and among several of the teachers and administrators they brought in, were strongly tinged by anti- or ambivalent feelings about authority, especially authority in the classroom. They associated this with traditionalism. Their feelings were strengthened by the reading many were doing in Holt, Kohl, Herndon, Neill, Dennison, and others. A strong revolt against traditional methods permeates these works, and perhaps with the exception of Dennison, they may be said to reflect in their writings marked utopic expectations and prescriptions concerning the role and place of adult authority in the classroom.[3]

These ambivalences and anti- feelings about authority (and its identification with traditionalism) helped provoke a polarized anti-response among many conservative and traditionally minded people in Freeport-- a counter-rebellion, which proved to be a difficult legacy for the new administration that took over the running of the Freeport schools in the fall of 1970.

---

[3] I exempt George Dennison mainly on the basis of ch. 4 of his Lives of Children. cf. especially p. 115 of the Vintage edition.

Thus, rebellion as defiance was at the root of the impetus for change in Freeport. But elements of emulation were also much in evidence. "We needed to get some brain power into the system," said a Pettit Board member, to which they all agreed. There was a general feeling among them that Freeport was falling behind, behind other towns, behind the country at large. They were impatient at the inefficiency, at the lack of sophistication in operations of the school. There was too much in-breeding in their estimation, too much nepotism, too much provinciality.

This spirit of emulation became stronger, relative to either defiance or a striving for new values altogether, when with the elections of March, 1971, a new popular leader emerged, Merton D. (Bud) Filmore. He was strongly supported and influenced by Pettit Board oppositionists and the spirit of counter-rebellion. However, when he became chairman in 1972 he pursued a moderate course. He was strongly moved by a feeling that Freeport had fallen behind, especially behind the surrounding towns like Brunswick or Yarmouth. He applied pressure consistently in the direction of improving the measurable performance level of the schools. He backed a new elementary sequentially organized reading program and went along with the elimination of the tracking system which came along with it. But his support did not extend to the new open school project for 80 pupils at the Soule elementary school in South Freeport which had gotten under way in 1971, before he became chairman. But neither did he oppose it. He resisted efforts by militant, traditionally-minded, anti-Pettit Board members to change Soule back again.

The emulative approach, as expressed in Fillmore, does to a degree carry with it the suggestion of a new value. Defiance may still be an element but much more in the forefront is a desire for something better, understood in terms of greater achievement and upward mobility. But in this, the question "what is all that achieving and mobility for," "what is it worth intrinsically," is not asked. The answers are assumed, or are accepted as having been given elsewhere. The important thing is to get what is available, or might be available, in order to compete on more equal terms.

In this respect Fillmore carried forward that part of the Pettit Board's concern to get the school system moving again with greater brain power, efficiency and willingness to experiment. However, there was more contained in the Pettit Board's rebellion and defiance than this. It pushed beyond older traditional definitions and newer emulative definitions and towards newer definitions altogether. At that time (1969-70) these were being called open or free conceptions of schooling among the Pettit group, though the words were carefully muted for political reasons. What these new ways might mean and how they could be worked out in actual practice--this was much less clear to them. The new team of administrators they brought in included people who would set about generating and implementing such change, as for example, the Soule School mentioned above. I return to this in the discussions on consciousness, strategy and leadership style below.

Collins Brook Free School

CBS, as the free school came to be called, can also be said to have been founded, and sustained, in a spirit of rebellion. One might generalize its history during the first five years of its existence (1969-74) as a movement from rebellion towards the articulation and discovery-through-practice of a new value.

A New value was present from the start--expressed as the right of kids to be allowed the time and space for self-motivated growth. What this actually meant however in everyday existence of a school-community was not known to most of the participants; and among those like Dick and Sharon Watson, the co-founders, who did have some experience with that value-in-operation, it was only partially known. Their experience had not included, for example, starting up a new school and being directors of it, responsible for it. In addition their commitment to the value of free learning did not include an awareness of the many pitfalls stemming from their own and others' anti-feelings (especially towards authority, but also towards academic, achievement, values). These anti-feelings were much in the foreground at the start; in the fire of experiment, and finding their own way, these feelings were tempered and re-integrated. In the process, the earlier commitment to free learning took on more shape and substance; limits were set and recognized and accepted. The lines between freedom and license grew clearer; likewise, the line between the socially desirable and the socially possible. Gradually as well, though not to the same degree, the line between intellectual development and academic alienation was explored and became a little clearer.

In this evolution, emulation played a much smaller role, though it partly activated the consciousness of the founders (Dick and Sharon Watson) in so far as they mentally compared their project to the Lewis-Woddhams free school in upstate New York where both had had important shaping experiences as teachers.

Rebellion was manifested in various ways:

(a) in the feeling of one of the two founders, Dick Watson, derived from his experiences at Lewis Woddhams, that there he had not really been included by the leader in decision-making, a feeling that was an important factor in wanting to establish his own "thing", and to do it differently.

(b) in the initial hesitancy, lasting over a period of 2-1/2 years, to define roles clearly, or to articulate some basic rules governing behavior, especially concerning "dope and sex;"

(c) in the strong commitment to an educational atmosphere of "letting be;"

(d) in the refusal, as Dick Watson later put it, to affirm the need for leadership, and to demarcate the rights of leadership and staff responsibility;

(e) in the anti-academic and anti-authoritarian and anti-parental attitudes of students, especially those of high school age;

(f) in the acting-out of hitherto unexpressed needs by some teachers to whom free meant much more an escape from the "mickey mouse" and alienation of "the system" than it could, at that point, mean a new way of ordering human relationships; they did express notions of a new way but the expression tended to be in utopic language of automatic spontaneity coupled with aggressive feelings against role differentiation and leadership;

(g) in feelings by staff members of not being "let in" on decision making (duplicating the experience of Dick Watson at Lewis Woddhams);

(h) in ambivalent feelings toward parental involvement; and finally,

(i) in the rebellion of the co-founder, Sharon Watson, against the early-on _de facto_ role she found herself, in spite of herself, getting into as "Dick's wife" and "mother-in-chief."

Most of these manifestations of rebellion came out only in the experience of living and learning--through the actual process of working out the commitment in practice. The third year was especially traumatic. The school had taken a leap forward. High school age students were admitted for the first time in substantial numbers. In the first year the school had started with eight younger children--all of them with parents in the community, i.e. they were "day kids." There were problems of bullying but these were successfully worked out in an atmosphere of caring and "working with"--both with the kids and their parents. The concept of the meeting was introduced. At the meetings, which could be called by anyone, a frank exchange of feelings and problems was encouraged. A process of working out conflicts was thus started which became a major part of the way of life at the school. During the first year and the second year, in which the number of younger children increased to about a dozen and some young teen agers were added as boarders, a spirit of camaraderie was being developed. Indeed, in the opinion of most of the parents of the kids who started the school, it was the intention of the school originally to build up from the bottom and accept only a few students coming in laterally at older age levels.

But the third year saw the coming in of about a dozen kids of high school age, most of them from out of state and most of them consequently boarding students. This made the school quasi-day and quasi-boarding. The older kids, as they came to be called, did not fit in readily with the ways of the free school as they had been worked out during the first two years; and since they came in in such numbers, it proved hard to find ways of adaptation.

The problem was greatly compounded by the state of profound rebellion the older kids were in against the academic, the parental, and authority generally. In addition the additional teaching staff seemed also to be moved by many of the same feelings, the same anti-'s. They were all in a state of trying to figure out what freedom was all about. But at the same time they were hampered in their search for ways to interact and ways to grow socially and intellectually together by warped outlooks and hurt psyches acquired from their social and educational experience hitherto. The very atmosphere of "letting be" and of "getting stuff out," *e.g.*, in meetings, seemed to invite, indeed exacerbate (in the short term at any rate), the feelings of insecurity, anger, unease, apathy and drive for freedom and selfexpression that had remained "bottled up" till that time.

A crisis occurred during October/November. It was occasioned by an open, declared, love affair between a dynamic and highly popular male teacher of the older and middle kids and a male teen-age student. The ensuing turmoil wrecked the school. Homosexuality was "supposed to be" not an issue, though conflicted feelings about it were operative. Sexual love between teacher and student, openly declared (*i.e.* insisting on its legitimacy), became an intense issue. But these more immediate questions also triggered a range of conflicts imbedded in the dualities that are described above in the previous chapter.

Many students and staff and the Director felt identity conflicts--torn both ways on the issues and wondering where they themselves really stood, trying to sort out their feelings and what they ought to feel.

Many day parents, two of whom had professional psychological training, were utterly opposed to the notion of sexual love between teacher and student, describing it as a form of incest. Other parents pointed to its illegality under state statutes, and that the school could be closed down.

Many students saw this as parental surveillance and typical conventional behavior. Many saw a conflict of interest between the needs of younger kids (in their little school) and older kids and saw a threat to the welfare of the former.

A sharp conflict began to show up more and more clearly between individual staff members and students on one hand and the Director on the other. The Director, Dick Watson, in the beginning wanted to trust the process, primarily the meeting, to thresh the problem out and have the school come to a solution together. Increasingly he grew restive with this. In addition the pressure of day parents on him (for him to make a decision, and the right one) grew more intense. Those applying pressure wanted him to fire the teacher forthwith. His efforts to exercise leadership proved initially unacceptable to some staff and students. The latter felt, and communicated the feeling, that the school was a community and decision-making was no one person's prerogative.

They felt threatened by the exercise of authority. In the end Dick Watson came to a decision to ask the teacher to leave and finally fired him.

In the event, several day parents withdrew their children, the fired teacher died in an auto crash in December, and the school was left in a bemused state for some time, trying to sort out what the entire event meant to them severally, together, and as a school. We'll pick up the threads of this in later chapters.

Upward Bound

The Upward Bound program at Bowdoin evinces certain classical forms of rebellion: (a) the rebellion of the white middle class intellectual on behalf of the disadvantaged against the exclusionary forces of "the system"; (b) often concomitant therewith, attitudes of rebellion against what is perceived by the innovators as rule-fixation and the authoritarianism of conventional education; (c) rebellion by program administrators, staff people, many teachers and most students against "academic" forms of learning; and (d) rebellion mainly by students in the program and some teachers against parental authority, and against what is perceived as parent-surrogate authority.

However, the rebellion is not as strong, or as far reaching, as in Freeport or Collins Brook School. It is mitigated and undercut by strong emulative desires which move the program and participants in it (administration, staff, teachers and students) towards upward mobility and consumption values. The felt deprivation of these things by the youth being served is high; their corresponding desire to savor the "goodies" of the system (to quote one participant) is therefore high; the economic pressure on the program by the government to show ("upward mobility") results is considerable; and the symbolic presence and pressure exerted by a prestigious Ivy League College is also substantially influential in this direction.

Thus, the "desire for something better" does animate the Bowdoin College Upward Bound Program; that desire continues to be expressed (a) in terms of upward mobility, and (b) in terms of exposure of each student to a variety (some critics say a "potpourri") of alternatives, a notion allied with the first.

But the program also partly expresses a desire for a development of greater sense of self and clearer sets of relationships with others. In this sense it points beyond emulation to a new value. But whether it is because the program and its leaders remain caught up in syndromes of rebellion and emulation; or because the youth that are served continue to have strong traditional and conventional needs; or whether it's from external forces that circumscribe in similar ways--there seems to be no pushing through and beyond defiance and emulation towards a new value and towards the enacting of a new structure whose roles, relationships, and meanings would (a) be more consistent with the rhetoric of openness in the program; and (b) be relatively transparent to the participants in it.

The structure continues to be hierarchic and parental, crowned by a strong charismatic woman; there is substantial participation in decision making at lower levels, a phenomenon that is regularly pointed to as definitive or descriptive of "how things work here" in general. The program continues to be a combination of a smorgasbord of offerings in which everyone has a chance to do or find "his or her own thing," and a set of academically oriented offerings.

In this connection there should be noted the presence of a continuing counter-revolt on behalf of academic values on the part of some teachers and among members of the College Committee that oversees the program. It generally takes the form of quasi-defensive demurrals by academically oriented people arguing for substance and skills. Their posture on the one hand is influenced by the need to "relate to" people from a provincial and disadvantaged culture and to "relate to" the prevailing ideology of the program which is expressed in terms of equality, the overcoming of role differences, getting kids interested, moving from where the kids are, being informed and so forth. This on the one hand, and on the other hand they are influenced by the settled notions concerning what constitutes standards of achievement, academic excellence, and subject matter knowledge generally. So they feel ambivalence and manifest behavior which is neither all one thing or the other but which is generally perceived as the "conservative" component in the program.

It is a stabilizing force that lends the program an image of credibility. The program thus contains a strong academic element with emphasis in achievement and skills; an anti-academic element intent on encouraging kids to savor a variety of experiences, interact with one another, and enjoy themselves; and a smaller number of people (staff and students) who would like to steer a course between the two (intellectually serious and child oriented) but have trouble finding a way to bring the whole program to move in that direction, failing which they constitute yet another element in the prevailing smorgasbord.

Brunswick

Changes in the Brunswick school system seem at first sight to have been spurred primarily by emulative desires--"keeping up with developments elsewhere," meaning progressive suburban areas, such as around Boston. This is perhaps fitting for a school system that is one of the most "advanced" and financially well off in the State. This was certainly strong, especially among the college-oriented professional groups and related business people who have tended to "run things" in the schools.

However, not so very far beneath the surface of things one readily perceives a degree of rebellion as defiance. One form of it, and part of the inspiration for a new "open structured" elementary school, was dissatisfaction at the way kids were being treated in the schools. A prominent publicist at a memorable open board meeting in January, 1970, noted acidly that every time he passed by the high school he had to control a wish that somehow it would burn down. Many parents felt that their children were being stifled. Many focused their anger on a junior high principal who was reported to have used physical violence in disciplining kids and defending it.

Even more people focused their anger on a superintendent with an authoritative style, or as they would have it, authoritarian. When he also became a major barrier to the creation of a new school administrative district in which Brunswick would unite with three neighboring towns; and a barrier to the development of a separate new elementary school as noted in the previous chapter (he adamantly insisted on adding to an existing one) the opposition against him became intense. A new school board composed mostly of college and business liberals removed the superintendent, hired a new one committed to more progressive forms of education, and saw that the plans for the new school were rapidly put into operation.

Yet the spirit of rebellion was not profound; much stronger was the spirit of steady emulation among the innovators. And though at the very beginning the language of the committee exploring new possibilities was fairly replete with abstractions about openness and experimentation in the classroom, the language and the mood rapidly evolved into emphasis on flexible education, differentiated staffing (the new superintendent's "baby"), team teaching, individualized instruction, and improved rationalization in the sequences of learning. These were seen as helping the Brunswick school system perform better and as helping kids move more effectively and in a more satisfied frame of mind from K through grade 12.

The "desire for something better" is present here but it takes primarily the form of emulative impulses, a mental comparison to what liberal-progressive suburban schools at the forefront of the prevailing system are presumably doing. This was apparently seen as good enough by most of the members and leaders of the dominant group, though it wasn't really enough for some. This included such people as the woman (a school board member and former principal) whose decisive action at a town meeting successfully combatted the then superintendent's recommendation for adding on to an existing school instead of building a new innovative one; or such as several of the teaching staff of 18 who began at the new school (Jordan Acres) when it opened in September, 1972. In them the rebellion had been deeper and stronger. But they remained a minority.

However, rebellion also came, and came strongly, from different sources: members of the school board and city council who represented old Yankee culture on the one hand and the substantial segment of Franco-American citizens on the other. The emulative progressive suburbanesque dream was not theirs. Partly they rebelled against that dream because it was the dream of the upper class. More basically they were rebelling against what they felt to be their exclusion, their being left out of the real decision making and policy making in the schools. Furthermore, they were suspicious of those reformers whose rebellion against traditional, authoritarian, and manipulative modes of education seemed in their eyes to be pushing them towards in-discipline and permissive upbringing of kids. They were militant in their opposition to such "freedom." They tended to equate these reformers with the affirmers of the high-achievement suburbanesque dream.

The mainstream college, professional, and business leaders quelled the more abrasive attacks from old Yankee and Franco-American leaders and built bridges towards moderates in these groups and among their own ranks by "sacrificing" more radical aims or otherwise diluting them ("if you insist on a full loaf you-we will get nothing;" "politics is the art of the possible," and so on). They ended up with a new school at Jordan Acres without very many internal walls in the physical sense; with a program of elementary education at that school which permits some flexibility within the prevailing pattern of high-achievement oriented education; and with a pattern of school administration and structuring of relationships throughout the system which remain imbedded in command assumptions and behavior. The hierarchical class structure in the town is mirrored in the hierarchical command structure in the schools. Of Brunswick, to a far greater degree than of the other three programs studied, it can be said that the more things change, the more they stay the same.

This account of Brunswick does not sufficiently take into account the persisting efforts of many individuals (a) to overcome pockets and vestiges of a moribund traditionalism in classroom and office or to revitalize a stagnating achievement-oriented curriculum; and (b) to try to launch forth in a more open direction, especially at Jordan Acres new school.[4] Yet insofar as administrative processes and behavior, reaching from the Superintendent to the head teachers and "below," continue to be rooted in older bureaucratic, and newer command-oriented, attitudes and procedures, and insofar as these impinge on communication flows and on the above named efforts, to that degree such efforts remain at best "individual." They suggest only idiosyncratic ripples in an otherwise unchanged channel. I touch on this again in both my discussions of strategy and style below.

---

[4] Chapter Three discusses the differences between traditionalism, achievement-oriented and open education; and Chapter Four distinguishes the manner in which any one of these belief-styles is held on to. In Brunswick one found instances both of a status-quo traditionalism and status quo achievement oriented education--hence the use of adjectives such as moribund and stagnating.

Chapter Three

Belief Styles

Statements of goals are necessary for the practitioner of change, and they must be taken seriously by the researcher. As such, however, they are insufficient indicators of the beliefs of those involved in change. What these beliefs are tend to be revealed to the practitioner, as well as to the researcher, in the process through which programs are enacted.

Goal statements tend to be generalized and rhetorical--and they tend for that reason to be more closely related to distributive concerns than to growth concerns. They seem to serve a political need, whether to define a direction for public policy, or to find and express a common basis on which "everyone" could or "would naturally" agree.

A familiar and nearly universal claim made by almost everyone in all the programs studied was along the lines of "we believe in the best possible education for the child." This type of statement was equally characteristic of the free school, Upward Bound, the Reading Program and Open School project in Freeport and the Jordan Acres project in Brunswick. This formulation of goals has the character of a litany and because it so single-mindedly focuses on the child (and ignores either parent or teacher) it is a source of profound mystification in the schools.[1] But it also serves a profound political need as a means to gain and assure credibility. Its strength and universality is also, in addition, a function of the fact that it provides a way of expressing a common, universal need and desire--a commitment--to the growth of children; it becomes in that sense a "non-political" essence serving an existential political need, and having its character modified in the process.

Goal statements, in addition to being general and political, tend also to have an abstract character. What words such as free (Collins Brook) or open (Soule School) or flexible (Jordan Acres) or exposure to alternatives (Upward Bound) mean is not altogether clear in advance to the practitioners involved--even though they do convey a preliminary meaning or intention that prove forceful in shaping the program. These terms seem necessarily to remain abstract, however, until, for example, as in the case of Collins Brook in the first year, the phenomenon of bullying was encountered, lived through, and overcome. The meaning of the experience was summed up symbollically by the teachers, parents and kids in a new phase, for them, of "freedom, not license."

Or, goal statements are abstract in the way that overly specific facts are abstract, they tend to lack a context in which they could come alive. Such oft repeated goals as individualized instruction, differentiated staffing, ungradedness, team teaching, classrooms without walls, sequential learning, and so forth seemed abstract in spite of sounding so specific, or because they were so specific. They contained something, some kind of meaning for what education would be like if these singly or in various combinations were to be put into practice, but what they portended for the structure of relationships in a classroom and in a school--what they portended for the ordering of roles, the relationships of people, and the meanings these relationships would have--this was unclear. It was unclear because it was incomplete. And it was incomplete partly because it would take putting them into practice in actual programs to discover what they meant. By doing this it would become more clear what kinds of beliefs about education were coming to be exemplified in the programs--and in or among the people challenging the program. Practice develops, and is a spur to, self-definition.

---

[1] This point is taken up in more detail in the conclusions (Part III).

In the evidence I gathered I found, in whole or in part, the exemplification of six contrasting, and often conflicting, belief-styles of education. All six are rooted in the same passion for growth. But they define differently how growth can best be facilitated, or effected. They tend to emphasize different elements or factors in the growth process (as for example child, parent, teacher, subject matter).

Again, all six are concerned about learning as gaining in competence and concerned about learning as gaining in relating oneself and being related to the world and to others in the world, i.e., a concern about authority. But they differ on how this learning, this "competence," can most appropriately, most "rightly," be accomplished.

The following is a profile of each of the six.

Traditional. Discipline is a key phrase and a key concern for traditionally minded people. This is meant by them in at least three senses. First it applies to manners and overt behavior. There is an emphasis on obedience (in the classroom, by the child) to people who are seen and justly held to be in superior positions--teachers, administrators, parents. Second, it applies to standards of knowledge which are felt to "exist" as things to be learned and which it is the teacher's responsibility to impart. Third, it applies to the notion of discipleship in the relation of learner to teacher. There is a strong suggestion of warmth in this--of personal relationship and concern though within of course the strict hierarchical limits already noted.

The teacher is seen for the most part as a parent surrogate, with duties extending to the whole of the child's needs and entitled to the deferential respect of the child. There is a tendency to see the child as a being, who though correctable and improvable, nevertheless has come into the world with drives that are antithetical in many important ways to learning and civilized behavior. This is fed by traditional religious ideas often, such as the traditional, conventionalized, Christian view of original sin.

Furthermore, traditionally minded people tend to regard education as a means to serve the needs of the parents, or as they might put it with Edmund Burke, the continuity of the generations. I visited classrooms in which many if not all of these elements were manifest. Yet for the most part, traditional education in the Freeport and Brunswick schools was in a state of decline, apparently unable to cope with new pressures and in a relatively stagnant state that resisted change. This provoked strong rebellion among progressives, who tended to regard traditional education scornfully as ipso facto anti-growth. This posture in turn invited a counter-rebellion among many traditionally-minded people who felt that they were deeply committed to growth and for that reason wanted to sustain the old ways which they saw as the only proper way to attain it.

Achievement-oriented education

There are some overlaps with traditional. An emphasis on discipline as meaning standards relating to objective and objectively knowable and communicable skills and facts and concepts is not unlike the traditionalist's emphasis on standards. But the third aspect of discipleship is rejected as being too personal and subjective. There is greater reliance on objectively measurable performance, and on breaking the knowledge-intake process down into smaller and sequentially integrated steps leading gradually from ignorance of skills and facts and concepts to greater and greater intake. There is consequently greater emphasis proportionately on subject matter than on personal dimensions in the process and relationships of learning. There is also a shift towards an emphasis on rational designs and rational procedures in the classroom and in the school system. Thus, tidiness and efficiency are highly valued. Things and property (personal property and public property) are highly valued. Professional demarcations are insisted upon; and, in administration, the overall organization and orchestration of specialties and specializations is at a premium.

As regards the first aspect of discipline (respectful behavior) there is some agreement and some disagreement with traditionalism. Agreement in the sense of need for good behavior and tidiness. But disagreement in that there is an overt exercise of authority in traditional modes and a more indirect, carrot and stick, (positive and negative reinforcement) approach in achievement modes. Liberal achievement-oriented people, tax traditionalists with authoritarianism and domination; conservatives tax achievement-oriented people with wanting and getting the same result (obedience) through manipulative and even hidden methods. (Radicals tend to agree with conservatives about the latter and with liberals about traditionalists.)

Again there tends to be overlap with tradition on the attitude towards what children are "by nature." Achievement-centered people, though rejecting "original sin" and other versions of the same thing, yet postulate the relationship of teacher to learner as primarily a one-way imparting of knowledge into the waiting receptacle; the latter is variously viewed as passive tabula rasa, or as needing to be habituated to receiving knowledge, or as needing to be sufficiently under control t6 be amenable to the intake of knowledge.

The achievement approach is closely allied with desire to get ahead, to gain distinction through credible performance; in certain forms it takes on aspects of "the Protestant ethic" and it has much in common with--and appeals to--the push for upward mobility and emulation.

Brunswick, more than the other systems studied, is much imbued with this belief-style of education. It clearly overpowers both the older traditional modes and some newer impulses towards individualism on the one hand and open education on the other. In Freeport it may become the dominant pattern, though both traditional and open forms are vital. In Upward Bound it has become a powerful force, though sharing space with a potpourri of individualist, traditional, and open styles. It is virtually not in evidence at Collins Brook.

Individualist-Consumer-oriented education

Here, education is thought of as bringing together a collection of people, relatively atomistic, each of whom wants something. Each one contracts in, and out, for what he wants and he receives services or other kinds of rewards in proportion to his willingness or ability to pay. Some students and/or their parents want to achieve rapidly (though apparently less for its own sake or for ambition's sake than for the sake of opportunity to consume); some want to "emote;" others want to listen to music, or to watch TV; others want to do nothing; still others want to get by. Similarly, teachers want different things, but no one service is more highly valued than another. The learning process is a market with pay-offs proportionate to what you put into it. There are overlaps with an achievement-orientation and with open and free styles.

The individualist-consumer orientation is in evidence at Upward Bound, though carefully circumscribed by achievement and open concerns. It is also a factor at Collins Brook, though strongly muted by the community atmosphere generated by the free model in practice. It continues to be a consequential emphasis in Brunswick and Freeport.

Open-centered education

There is strong overlap both with achievement concerns and free concerns, and might be described as a hybrid of these two. Of all the styles here described it is perhaps the most child-centered in belief and in practice. In some limited respects it suggests older traditional type emphasis on the value of personal exchange--but it strives for that exchange in a non-authoritarian mode. Mutual respect is sought less on the basis of clearly defined hierarchical roles than on a personal relationship of mutual problem solving. The self-motivation of the child is put at a premium--but consistent with the need to take in basic knowledge of skills, facts, and concepts. Children are encouraged to work together and to think and feel as a community, but the basic approach in the classroom is a multifaceted interchange of the teacher(s) with the children severally as individuals. The spirit of mutual give and take is strongly valued. The teacher is expected, and expects of herself or himself, to be at once a friend of students, a parent surrogate, and adult guide; to organize things "invisibly" and as much as possible "in advance" so that as much psychic and physical space as possible is made available for self-choices by students.

There is less concern here with intake of skills, facts, concepts than there is in the achievement mode and more with what critics from the latter persuasion regard as "personal growth" (as distinct from growth in competence) or as "emotional development." There is also less concern for tidiness or for property or for noise when it is a question of a choice between these values and availability of materials, opportunity for personal interaction, and a child's sense of time, orderliness, or noise.

The open concept decisively breaks with the above concepts on the question of who the child is--it strongly supports the belief in the natural desire of the child to learn and to acquire responsible self growth. The open concept is most clearly manifest in Soule School in Freeport and from there it has strongly influenced the rest of the elementary system in Freeport. It is present as a minority influence in Jordan Acres in Brunswick; there it is circumscribed by the pressure of numbers (625 pupils, k--5, in a building constructed without internal classroom walls), by strong achievement-centered pressures, and by administrative modes at variance with the spirit of the open style. The open-approach is to a degree followed at Upward Bound but must jostle for space with strong achievement and individualist pressures.

Free centered education

Free overlaps with open, but goes farther in some respects and not as far in others. It goes farther in the sense that, as someone put it, "kids at Collins Brook can swear, and they don't have to go to class, and they don't have to learn reading and math every day--this doesn't happen at Soule." Nor, it could be added, do they have to get up in the morning (if they are boarding, and somewhat over 50% are, though among the teenagers the proportion is much higher).

Yet, on the other hand, free does not go as far towards child-centeredness as does the open style. There is a greater emphasis on adults and adult needs, even though the primary and heavy focus of the school is on the child. There is also greater emphasis on community values even though the open style does share in some of that.

The emphasis on community differentiates the free style sharply from the individualist-consumer mode, even though there are strong pressures in the latter direction, and many apparent behavioral similarities. But the value of "letting be" in the free mode, and of "doing your own thing," is related sharply to the belief that this will lead to greater degree of self-direction, of self-limits, and to a sense of inter-active responsibility with other members of the same community. There is a strong emphasis on working out inter-personal dialectics on as equal a basis as possible so that individualism (often equated with isolation and loneliness)is overcome.

The acquisition of skills, concepts, and facts is not emphasized as much as in the open style. There is a hint of disinterest in strongly academic and intellectual pursuits, though that may be a function of early-phase rebellion that will gradually wear away. There is, however, substantial scope offered for adults to make demands on kids, within the limits of the free choices and availability of recourse to the frequent "meetings" that are part and parcel of the free approach.

The free approach is most clearly followed at Collins Brook, though there are also elements of individualism and of a differentiated style at the school. There are elements of a free approach in the other projects studied. This is seen especially in the belief in the primacy of the child and in the child's natural bent for learning and self-regulative capability that is shared to various degrees: by the program at Soule in Freeport, among a few of the teachers in the rest of the Freeport system and at Jordan Acres in Brunswick, and among some of the teachers and staff people at Upward Bound.

Differentiated education

This approach holds that there is no one "right" approach for all children in a classroom or a school and no one "right" approach for the same child all the time. This is the negative way of expressing what it is trying to get at. To put it in a positive way, it expresses the belief that in any given learning situation involving teacher and child, or teacher and several children, or a group of children by themselves, there is probably a better-than-most, or even best, way to enable growth to take place. To that end there is no fear in using as a tool of learning a traditional type of approach here, or an individualist type of approach there, or an achievement approach, or approaches that reflect an open or free emphasis. These are perceived and used as tools of learning and not as prescriptive models to define every or most situations. As situations change, and as they flow in and out of other situations happening at the same time, and as participants in these situations and their needs change, the mood and mode varies; there are continuing structural variations, continuing patterns of differentiated behavior aiming at a growth process that suits the particular dimensions of need and time/space frequencies of every being in that process.

In this approach the growth of the teacher and to a lesser degree that of the involved parent and administrator is as critical and as warranted as the growth of the child. It is held that the center of gravity is the total learning situation, and that this necessarily constitutes a converging matrix of interacting roles and persons.

A critical aspect is consciousness by the participants that decisions are being made on the basis of different needs for different people and that this is "right." The widespread feeling that "differentiated" means unfairness has been transcended, and gives way to a more holistic sense of different people having different needs at the same or at different times. This approach shares therefore the strong emphasis in the free approach on community.

There is a stronger emphasis on adult needs and on adult demands on kids in this approach than in either the free or the open styles. And in this sense it overlaps with (harkens back to) traditional and achievement belief-styles. But it is a more personal one than in the achievement style and it is a non-hierarchical, give and take process, by contrast to the traditional style.

While it posits a basic belief in the natural educability of children, the differentiated approach tends to see the process of growth as taking place in developmental stages, and to perceive the need for personal interaction of adults and children, with the former offering guidance to the latter, at each stage, and varying in accordance with the stage.

The Collins Brook School has moved in five years from a hybrid free-individualist approach towards a free approach with elements of differentiation in it. Soule School and some classrooms in the other parts of the elementary system in Freeport reflect elements of a differentiated model, as do Jordan Acres and other classrooms in Brunswick's elementary system. Upward Bound is hard to guage. In any event, these elements are fairly pale images of the differentiated approach and remain submerged in one or other of the five strains noted in the preceding.

This is a high, or remote standard--remote in the sense that there is not much likelihood of its being put fully into practice in the near future; but it is one in which I believe in more than in any of the others. I came upon it, and came to a belief in it, by doing this research project.

Chapter Four

The Manner of Commitment

I found important degrees of difference among people adhering to the same set of beliefs with respect to how they held on to their beliefs. I refer to this as the manner of commitment. I identified basically three types.

One type was an acceptance of beliefs as a set of well-established demarcations, distinctions and routines. The essential applicability of the beliefs to most or all problems and situations is unquestioned; the beliefs are generally felt to be unquestionable. People holding on to their beliefs in this manner tend to be wholly "inside" their beliefs. Beliefs have the status of an ethos.

Beliefs as ethos can envelop the adherents of any of the six belief-styles identified above. Often it is confused however with the traditional belief-style, as if only among traditionalists do you find this way of holding on to a commitment. But that is a liberal conceit which hides from the liberal's own consciousness the degree to which belief-styles in the achievement or open or free mode may also envelop a person or a group in a mantle of established verities.

An ethos-oriented way of holding on to a set of beliefs may readily fall into a maintenance-oriented or merely status quo pattern. In this case the belief-style grows moribund and stagnating. This had happened to the traditional mode of education in Freeport and produced a strong reaction from the progressives in the community led by the Pettit Board. The progressives tended to perceive the problem as one of traditional education per se, and in rebelling against the relatively stagnant form in which it appeared, to which it had sunk, they rebelled against it totally. They thus appeared antagonistic, dogmatic and threatening to many of the teachers, many or perhaps most of whom were traditionally oriented. There didn't seem to be any middle ground for the teachers on the basis of which they might work out a new pattern and thus preserve some of the strengths of traditional education.

This example illustrates a second type, which may be called reactive. This tends to happen when (a) an ethos-oriented adherent of a belief-style feels strongly threatened by strong attacks on that belief-style; or (b) when a person or group, in an act of rebellion against a prevailing set of beliefs and against their adherents, remains fixed within the aura of defiance. In that latter case, though a new set of beliefs may be adopted by the rebels in counter offensive and in competition with the old, nevertheless a dichotomous aggressive style is not transcended. The new mode is heavily infused with reactive tendencies.

Being reactive is to be highly militant, defensive and doctrinnaire about one's own beliefs and positions. It lends itself to "true believership" and ideological excess, whether in a conservative or a radical mode.

A third type is to hold on to a set of beliefs in a self-examined way, to feel that they are "right" for you; and simultaneously to feel that they are subject to modification through learning and growth. There is an implied ability to take some psychic and spiritual distance from one's own articulated beliefs. There is a sense in which the adherent of a set of beliefs can see them and hold them (a) as seriously and passionately wrought guides; (b) as useful vehicles of experimentation for getting along in the world; and (c) as opportunity for expanding on human possibility. This third type runs the risk of erosion of will because it is flexible and sees more than one "side" to a problem. It may also suffer insecurity through excess of experimentation.

As indicated in the above example from Freeport, both the Pettit Board and their oppositionists manifested reactive patterns in the manner of their commitment. What they were rebelling against came to loom so large in their consciousness as almost at times to crowd out, or even to substitute for, the need to articulate the practical meaning of the goals and belief-style they were for, or were feeling their way towards.

The Pettit Board's battle with traditionalism and authoritarian education came to identify them (by others and even to a degree by themselves) much more than their correlative effort to move towards more vital kinds of education in the achievement and open modes. The battle of the oppositionists against the Pettit Board was on behalf of loyalty to the best elements in traditional education, including a sense of decency and order in the classroom. But their posture, and their feelings, came to be dominated by antagonism against the Pettit Board and against what was perceived by them to be the Pettit Board's avowal of "free" education untrammelled by thoughts of discipline.

So the horns of these two groups became locked in an either/or battle of us vs. them.

The lock was broken by the Pettit Board. They brought in a new team of administrators in 1970. In two of the four, the high school and junior high school principals, there was evident a sturdy commitment to post-traditional modes of education, of both the open and the achievement varieties. But the manner of commitment tended towards a reactive type--reactive against authoritarian education. This helped fuel their commitment and helped make their style a dynamic one. It was perceived by the Pettit Board oppositionists, however, as permissiveness and as favoring some above others. Nor did the moderates in the community rally to their defense. After the elections of March, 1972, when the Pettit group lost its majority to oppositionists and moderates on the School Board, these two administrators were at first fired, and then allowed to resign.

The other two administrators were the Superintendent and the Elementary Supervisor. Their leadership styles will be examined more closely in later chapters. Here I wish to observe that the Elementary Supervisor, Marcia Keith, shared the two above administrators' commitment to post-traditional education. A newcomer from the Boston area, she came with a commitment to more vital forms of education, generally in the achievement mode. She soon began moving, however, more and more, towards an open concept of education and sought the same as much as possible in her role as administrator. But the manner of her commitment was less influenced by anti-feelings. She, contrary to the above administrators, seemed to be closer to the self-examined type, which, though not precluding a sense of rebellion against, or rejection of, a different belief-style, is able more readily to perceive and sort out its pluses and minuses. Therefore she did not feel the need to insist on being liberal, or doing what was thought to be the "liberal thing" all the time.

New Superintendent, Robert Cartwill, also from the Boston area, in his belief-style tended to gravitate strongly in an achievement-oriented direction. His manner of commitment reveal elements of defensiveness, suggestions of a reactive syndrome, towards open education and, to a degree, towards traditional education. In general, however, his manner of commitment is muted. It seems overborne by an "administrative" commitment, something more instrumental than substantive. Perhaps he illustrates a variant on the above three types. Indeed one might perhaps add a fourth type altogether, and call it pragmatic.

In Brunswick one found elements of a functioning traditionalism (an ethos pattern) and of a functioning achievement-centered education. Yet one also found strong indications that both of these belief-styles were foundering--becoming stagnant, or were seen that way by growing numbers of people. In addition they were seen by many to be inadequate, no matter how well they were functioning.

Two progressive currents emerged from this--one to reinvigorate achievement modes of education; the other to strike out for a distinctly open style of education. Both currents fed into the new Jordan Acres school.

Collins Brook and Upward Bound both presupposed dissatisfaction with stagnant traditional education and with achievement-oriented education no matter how well or poorly it was functioning. But in Upward Bound the manner of commitment was infused with strong anti- feelings (against authoritarian education) among students, staff and administrators. This reactive tendency, coupled with a strong self-protective, loyal attitude towards the program by the people in it, gave a consistently doctrinnaire flavor to the way in which Upward Bound was talked about and believed in by its members. There is a sense in which things done in and by Upward Bound were good because Upward Bound was doing them. This suggests an ethos orientation side by side with, perhaps emerging from, reactive patterns. Self-examined impulses were evident in the program, especially in the private conversations of many participants, but they didn't disturb the overall self-protective shell that enveloped the program.

To some considerable degree reactive patterns were evident at CBS from the start, and were reproduced in each year that new staff and new students joined the school-community. Also, as in Upward Bound, these patterns seemed to merge into a protective ethos, and thus as well into attitudes and language that revealed a certain doctrinnaire flavor. However, the early commitment to the putting into practice of a new value was stronger at CBS than at Upward Bound. In the latter, as noted in previous chapters, defiance and emulation remained strong and tended to overbear the struggle towards a new value. At CBS, conseouently, on the other hand, the manner of commitment seemed to grow away from reactive and ethos patterns and to grow towards a more self-examined posture. This is especially seen among the two directors, the two or three staff members who have remained with the school-community throughout and among the students who "grew up" with the school, especially some among them who have left to go back to public school and then have come back again to CBS. There is a clearer sense among them all of the limits of CBS, what it is and what it is not, and consequently a stronger, less defensive, more relaxed attitude towards what they are doing and what they mean in education and in the world.

Chapter Five

Consciousness

The four sets of factors described in the previous chapters all together point to, and anticipate, the factor of consciousness. I came to regard this as a key element in the course of the research. Consciousness may be described as the motive structure of the human being. It constitutes the basis, or ground, of perception and of action. It is a concept that intends to convey the lived (or self-experienced) energy flow of the human being.

Consciousness has several aspects. At the simplest level it means to have some awareness of how something that seems to be desirable or right or good actually would work out in real situations. Ideologies, or belief-styles, are not enough from the vantage point of a developing consciousness. They remain "abstract" and doctrinnaire unless they yield to, or embrace, some sense of what it means in concrete ways actually to put such and such ideas or goals into practice, actually to give them some measure of living embodiment in the lived life of the human species, including your own self as a living representative of the species.

For example if what is wanted is a more spontaneous learning situation for a child, there is required a certain level (or unblocked) flow of consciousness to imagine what that might mean to and for the teacher involved. Even the posing of that as a question to be faced (as distinct from a critical put-down of a teacher on the order of "why can't she shape up") is the beginning of consciousness in this case.

Or, for example, if what is wanted is a more interactive mode of relationship between a teacher and students; or a teacher and other teachers; an unobstructed flow of consciousness would enable a person insisting on this to apply that also to himself or herself: that is, to apply it concretely to his or her own relationships with that teacher, or with anyone else within the matrix of roles and relationships in that situation. If there is an awareness that "maybe I'll have to put on that shoe as well"--there is the beginning of consciousness.

A second, related, aspect is an awareness of "how it is" for the other person or group which one encounters in a given situation. This is not to be confused with sympathy, though this may be present (and more present in the degree to which there is this awareness); yet sympathy can distract and deflect a person from a more accurate assessment. To allow to come into awareness the standpoint of the other, noticing it, without assigning praise or blame as such, is a difficult discipline. Yet when it is accomplished it does much to compensate for the discontinuity factor noted in Chapter One. It also helps a person to overcome some of the rougher edges of rebellion in oneself. It may also lead a person towards a successful strategy of communication with others.

A third aspect of consciousness is some sense of how one is being seen by others. It includes a sense of "how I must be coming on to others." There is awareness that my authority role, for example, or my class status, or my customary way of comporting myself (for example, aggressively or passively) has an impact on how others perceive what I intend, what I do, what I say, and how this may distort the message I think I am communicating.

A fourth aspect is the comprehension of human relationships as a set of structures that are daily enacted by people in the pursuit of a common activity. It includes an awareness that changes in one part call forth compensatory changes elsewhere. The structural character of relationships is difficult to perceive, especially by an actor for change who is himself or herself engaged in the daily flow of actions and interactions that he is seeking to change or to shape in one direction or another. The ramifications and feedbacks are multiple and often opaque. Yet here again an awareness that reality occurs in the shape of structures which everyone involved in is daily enacting in his or her way, from his or her own role and value vantage point--this is the beginning of consciousness and informs the nature, scope and quality of action-for-change. It does much to foster an awareness of where bottlenecks are and of where and how new meanings can find scope for development. One may call this the relational perception in consciousness.

A fifth aspect is an immediate, palpable feeling or impulse that what is at stake in the process of acting-for-change, is a-coming-into-being of a new value, or of the revitalization of an old one. From my study and observation, I assume the presence of this impulse in the moment of rebellion. It may grow from that point until it emerges as the main force to which both defiance and emulation become subordinate. Or it may be blunted, even overborne, by defiance and/or by emulation. The flow of consciousness in that case is obstructed to a degree and turns back upon itself. The actors for change thus fall short of enacting new structures; i.e., a new ordering of roles, a new way of relating, and a new set of meanings.

A sixth aspect is distance. It may also be called a freedom (or will) to act. There is a point usually reached by the actor for change (and it may happen again and again) when he or she faces a crisis. Let us say that in the crucible of an event an actor for change wins through to a sense of distance from his or her own ego involvement. He or she is released from a preoccupation,or over-identification, with the instruments of the program, or even the program as a whole, by which he or she had chosen to accomplish change. The actor gains psychic or spiritual "space" and maneuverability.

There is revealed in this an ultimate risk-taking capability which "frees up" the actor for change from self-imprisonment in his or her own program or set of values objectively defined. In the crisis they seem to loom up over the actor as "forces" driving him or her.

He, or she, experiences alienation. The program, set of values, movement for change, have turned into things enslaving his or her ego and mental faculties. Awareness of this, and the ultimate willingness to risk, can liberate the self from such enslavement. The actor regains his or her inner poise. The will to act is released. Consciousness flows again, and what had seemed alienating (a force hovering over one) is now re-appropriated as things and beings to be related to, to move with, or to square off against, in a renewed effort at putting one's goals into practice.

There is of course no guarantee that this will happen. Moments of crisis may freeze a person and cause him or her to stop short, to turn aside into other pathways, to be satisfied with less, and thereafter to mistake his or her attachment to the program, and loyalty to its survival, as proof of accomplishment. Indeed good things may be happening in and to the program, including the satisfaction for the actor that comes from the security of his or her ego-identification with the program. But the change originally intended--a change that sought embodiment of a new value, this has not occurred. One has stopped short in mere defiance, or has adopted the emulative mode of accomplishment--or both.

To sum up--consciousness seems always to be present to some limited degree within the actors for change at the moment of rebellion and the commencement of their actions to effect change. Indeed consciousness and rebellion may be coeval, the one triggering the other.

Consciousness grows through practice, and indeed seems to wait upon practice for its growth. But it also seems that growth of consciousness will occur through practice only if there is a "prior" awareness that consciousness needs practice in order to grow. This may seem tautological, if not illogical altogether--unless we perceive it dialectically. Then we may say that since "in the beginning" there is (coeval with rebellion) a measure of consciousness, there is imbedded in that a germ of awareness of the need henceforth always to raise one's consciousness. This will then come to mean progressive and continuing stock taking of the meaning of practice (and "the facts") for one's goals and expectations, and of the meaning of one's goals and expectations for the shaping of "the facts" through practice. Consciousness thus becomes a key to strategy (cf. Chapter Seven); and it becomes the connecting link between the original rebellion and the effectuating of change; i.e., whether or not a new set of values is really coming-into-being.

In this dialectic, consciousness can be overborne by any or all three of the elements of rebellion--defiance, emulation, and new values. The program, or the actor for change, can become fixated in these directions to the degree that consciousness is crowded out. My hypothesis is that this fixation can occur if any of the three elements are or become too "strong" or too "weak" in the imagination of the protagonists of change.

Applying this supposition to the four programs studied, I find that

1. In Freeport the Pettit Board's rebellion took the form of a very strong, almost doctrinnaire, defiance of traditional education coupled with a somewhat over-generalized but intense commitment to new ways of teaching and learning. This strongly fueled their driving energy but it also tended to contain consciousness in narrow spheres and almost to crowd it out. I am trying not to praise or blame them for this--since the depth of their impatience and anger (defiance) was greatly a function of the inertia and ossification that had overtaken the predominantly traditional education in the schools. So perhaps there was no time to raise consciousness, or no inclination, or no situational cause to do so. The trend was toward confrontation and a resulting antagonism.

The point must be made, however, that consciousness was relatively low in terms of most of the aspects of consciousness noted above--does the shoe fit me and can I, would I, put it on if _I_ were a teacher (_i.e._, would _I_ want to change _tomorrow_ to an open classroom; am _I_ being open with the teachers whom I am demanding this of?); how am I coming on, do I know how I am being perceived, what kind of symbol (_e.g._ class, status) do I represent to those I want to persuade and change? Am I seeing things relationally? Am I trying to figure out what my stated values would mean in practice in Freeport classrooms; for Freeport parents? and so forth.

Different members of the Board and their fellow progressives would score differently on these criteria, some higher some lower. But as a whole they didn't take much time and effort for this, or had no time, or found no way to give themselves a chance to grow in that direction.

They did however vitally reflect one very important aspect of consciousness--the last one described above, distance. Pettit, both at the time and in retrospect, often said that no one was indispensable. Though he applied it freely to others as well (and alarmed them deeply), he seems to have meant it primarily for himself and his board. In the crucible of events surrounding and confronting them in the spring of 1970, this impulse or feeling helped them to stick it out and do the one action-for-change that was still available for them to do, and the fundamental one in that situation to do, which was to make a clean sweep of the administration and bring in "a new team."

Their feeling--and concept--of non-indispensability gave them soul-leverage with themselves. It freed them of the pull of emulation. It was the one aspect of consciousness that most tied in with their defiance, and it helped them turn that defiance into a clear, albeit narrow, vision of who they were in that situation and what they could and could not do. This is near the core of charisma, and admirable, but I myself feel that the charismatic consciousness, lacking as it does too many of the other aspects of consciousness, is too much driven by defiance and an overly generalized (insufficiently digested) set of values, i.e. strongly but abstractly perceived.

2. Still in Freeport, the new team of administrators

reflected different levels of consciousness. Defiance of authoritarian education was strong in the high school and middle school principals and this muted those aspects of consciousness that might have enabled them to relate more effectively to the more traditional teachers and the majority of parents. Their commitment to new values of teaching and learning was deeply serious, though tending toward the doctrinnaire and this too may have limited the growth of their consciousness through practice. They were unable to work out, or find through working out, a successful strategy in the face of the built-up resentment generated by the "great crisis" of 1970. This resentment and their anti- feelings about authority didn't mix.

Marcia Keith, Elementary Supervisor, seems more than most to reflect a balance in elements of rebellion and of consciousness. There was a sense of measured defiance in her posture against authoritarian education; an apparently decent respect for the gods of emulation; and a commitment to new values of a kind that emphasized being able to visualize them in practice. Her consciousness that values grow and adapt in and through the art of putting them into practice was hence very vital; and though her distance and her awareness of how she was coming on were not high, in overall terms her consciousness was well developed and capable of further growth.

The superintendent, Robert Cartmill, though mildly defiant towards traditional and open styles of education, was strongly emulative. This seemed to tie in with a steady disposition in favor of achievement-oriented education. His overall consciousness was not particularly high. There was one aspect of consciousness however that his actions and attitudes reveal--he was canny about how he and others were coming on--he was able, sometimes to surprising degrees, to get the "feel" of how he or programs in the school were being perceived. This helped him greatly in developing successful public relations with the town. Nevertheless, the strength of the emulative drive, and a continuing unresolved ambivalence towards the open school in South Freeport, combined to limit his consciousness. It tended to make him less effective overall in following through on impulses (including his own) towards basic change in the schools.

3. In Collins Brook School defiance of traditional and achievement modes of education was very strong. Commitment to new values was also very strong, but with a doctrinnaire tendency especially at the beginning. Also present was a somewhat generalized sense of what the new values of free education might mean in practice. The emulative element was however weak. This hid the danger that, being weak, it might be only recessive and would "come out" once the venture got under way and became successful. As CBS grows in credibility and stature this may emerge but it has not thus far.

Not only was the emulative element quiescent, but the defiance had no ready target except "the big bad world out there." But it was "out there." This meant that as the venture got under way, two things could happen--internal fighting in which there would be mutual accusation of "not living up to" the new way, whatever that might be; or a dawning recognition that "the enemy ... is us." This latter would feed a growing sense of need therefore to raise consciousness.

Both things began to happen at CBS and both seemed to come to a head in the events of the third year, as related in earlier chapters. Out of the crucible of those events there was formed the conviction of the need to build the element of consciousness-raising into the life of the school-community, especially for the staff. The following September they began the practice of opening the school year with encounter and consciousness raising sessions conducted by a trained person. There were follow-up sessions during the course of the year. This became a regular practice.

The Director, Dick Watson, took several training programs himself of this kind and eventually trained to be a group leader.

Earlier, in the traumatic events of the third year that surrounded the homosexual love affair between a teacher and a student, Dick Watson experienced his 'moment of truth." Was the school utterly indispensable to him? Was he bound to it with invisible fetters that he could not escape? Had it become an alienating force hovering over him? Was he "hung up" on it? Would his own identity be shattered if he lost it? These questions he began deeply to ask himself in the days before he finally made his decision to fire the teacher. Asking these questions of himself was already the act of taking distance from what he most "wanted" or "needed," and it eventuated in his being able to free himself sufficiently from what he thought he "needed." He came to realize a distinction between his own identity and needs and those of the school. This enabled him to take deliberate action on the crisis.

The Director, and the School, gained from that. It tied in with the growth of other aspects of consciousness, to create a basis for the surmounting of patterns of defiance (defiance stuck in the rut of defiance) and to create a basis for the coming-into-being of those values of free choice and self growth in learning that the defiance had all been about in the first place.

4. In Upward Bound it may briefly be noted that defiance and emulation were fairly sharp. Though this charged the program with considerable energy, it also tended over time to undercut consciousness. A need to transcend in the direction of a new value, and the correlative need to begin implementing it in the program, was indeed felt at the beginning and continued to be felt by many people in the program, some more, some less. And it had impact. But it was steadily overborne by attitudes of defiance and counter-defiance towards "the system;" by unresolved ambivalence towards the meaning of authority; and it was overborne by an equal degree of ambivalence toward "middle class values," which were on the one hand put down and dismissed as inadequate, but which

on the other hand, and in the end, were admired and emulated by most of the participants and by the operating priorities of the program.

5. In Brunswick the pattern is complicated but the main lines indicate:

(a) a weak defiance syndrome in many influential establishment liberals for reform;

(b) a stronger defiance syndrome on the part of a smaller number of liberals, many of them not so influential;

(c) fairly strong emulative impulses in the reform programs (a factor which tended to give support to improving achievement-centered education, but which tended to limit those who wanted to push harder for open education, these latter also being those in whom anger at the system was stronger); and

(d) sharp counter-rebellion defiance from non-establishment groups (a factor which was a further pressure on the reform minded administrators), blunting the movement to open education.

Consciousness thus seemed low in Brunswick overall: It correlates with abortive rebellion among liberals; with persistent counter-rebellion among defenders of discipline and old-fashioned virtues; and with an overall tendency to emulate what the better school systems are doing in and around Boston or, closer to home, in wealthy Cape Elizabeth.

Chapter Six

The Dual Face of Compromise

Events and decisions in the four programs revealed the presence of two kinds of compromise. In some cases they seemed distinctly one or the other, but in many they seemed to intermingle so that, unless one carefully studied the context in which they occurred, it was not easy to discern which "face" was paramount.

The two faces relate to the distinction between distributive concerns and growth concerns that is described in the last chapter of Part One. Compromise may be a function of distributive calculations to a greater or less degree; or compromise may be a function of growth intentions to a greater or less degree. If the former, the following imperatives come into play: calculations of indirect or remote consequences; considerations of the need to do this here in order for that to happen there and then; choice of the "lesser evil" now in order to preserve one's options, or to gain greater ones; settling for the apparent adjustment of values or goals in this situation in order to meet unexpected obstacles or what seem to be overbearing pressures; adapting the timing of things and the degree to which you push for fulfillment of aims, to the ego tensions among the participants; sensitivity to and willingness to make quid pro quos (this for that); a ready responsiveness to demands for fairness; and so forth.

The programs revealed an abundance of these imperatives of compromise. They also revealed an abundance of imperatives in which "all of that" was "forgotten," or transcended, or felt to be part of the picture but distinctly subordinate. In this case the immediacy of the direct learning and growing experience is paramount. There is a seeming spontaneity and flow in the learning process and in the relations between adult and child, or between child and child, or adult and adult. Personal directness and the excitement of personal and mutual discovery (between "equals" or "unequals," it doesn't matter) is central and is felt to be central. The emphasis is on "doing it," on learning something new, on being there to learn something by trying and failing and trying again, and on enjoying the feeling of doing that.

I found examples of this in all the programs studied, in and out of the classroom, among students, among teachers and among administrators. I found it in traditional classrooms (the slow dawning smile of recognition that one has measured or discovered something and the self-enjoyment of that) as well as in open and free learning situations, though with this difference that in the latter cases the intention is more decidedly to create the joy of learning (to create "the unbought grace of learning," to paraphrase Edmund Burke). The difficulty is that one may try so hard to create this that you end up blunting what you so earnestly sought.

Nevertheless, and despite that, I found a higher incidence of the joy of learning in the open and free belief-styles of education than in the traditional or achievement-centered modes.

I have digressed. The point is that in no event or situation or learning encounter did I find a "pure type," either of the imperatives of indirection and compromise simply, or of the imperatives of directness and joy of learning simply. The other seemed always to be present in each, to a degree.

Admittedly some events or encounters seemed to have very little of the other. Over here compromise seemed to be very visible, seemed to have become almost a typical style of action and behavior, an end in itself. Over there it seemed virtually invisible, especially in particular situations or learning encounters, and insofar as it was present it seemed not to be hindering but actively supporting and even actually endemically a part of the particular learning experience.

I therefore suggest that compromise wears two faces. It blends in with growth and serves it or it blends in with the distributive intention and serves it. In the latter case it may appear as soft and subtle manipulation or as more stringent subordination of means (the compromise of means) for the sake of an overriding distributive end, let us say the overthrow of a given structure or the forcing through of a given policy.

Some examples of the two faces of compromise are as follows:

1. At Collins Brook School there were many instances of what were called "letting be." This was related to a process which Dick Watson called "undoing." Students coming to CBS were often full of rebellion that had formed in their minds and characters as a result of experiences in conventional schools and at home. The environment of the school offered them an opportunity not to "have to" do this or that. They thus felt free from the nagging and the constraints and externally imposed rules characteristic of their previous home and school life. In many of them this meant a period of "doing nothing," of being aimless, of getting up in the morning or not getting up in the morning, of talking or not talking, of moving about or not moving about, of going to classes or not going to classes, as they pleased; it often included being finicky and hard to get along with and gratuitous and demanding, including the demand to be left alone, when *they* pleased. In some this lack of apparent purpose or of "have tos" seemed an additional burden so that to the original feeling of being thwarted and powerless, which so many brought with them from the outside, there came to be added the impotence of not knowing what to do, or indeed not knowing if there was anything to do (implying a sense of defeat).

"Letting be" was a general concept applied by the staff to all the kids in the school in the sense that everyone should be allowed "to be," as Lea Watson--Dick's sister and for several years a staff member--forcefully put it. That is, kids must be protected in their "space" so that they will come in their own time, when it feels right, to do things, to learn, to expand in their skills and their self-growth. The belief was that the more secure a person feels in his or her space the quicker that person will begin to do. Sharon Watson, after Les's departure, came more and more to be a central symbol and implementor of this intention at CBS.

For those, especially the younger kids, for whom the shadow of conventional constraints had fallen less severely, letting be more easily flowed into doing. For the older kids however, whose exposure to the hang-ups of home and conventional schooling had been longer, letting be meant in practice a longish, sometimes seemingly unending period of aimlessness. Dick Watson persisted however in applying the concept of letting be to them, and described his policy as one of "un-doing" what had previously been done badly by home and school. The process of undoing had to work itself out, he argued, before one could rightly expect a movement towards doing. Not that efforts at getting kids "to do" during such a process couldn't be tried, but these should be tentative; more effort should be put into ways of helping the person get a feel for him or herself, find ways to release anger, find ways to feel comfortable with themselves. Connie Pennington, a dynamic teacher of the older kids--hired after the trauma of the third year--disagreed with this though not entirely. She felt that an over-emphasis on the undoing could in fact stand in the way of helping kids grow. She argued that getting kids to focus on doing things and on objective tasks was in itself an effective way of "undoing." "Have to's" were often good for people, she reasoned, or else how are they going to be shaken out of, or shake themselves out of, their aimlessness and lethargy.

Dick generally stuck to his policy. One of the most dramatic illustrations was afforded by the spectacle of Lisa, a person in her early teens, lying for months on the couch (it later came to be exaggerated into two years) in the main room of the school, sleeping or half-sleeping during most of every day, and seldom budging from that position. She was taking a lot in, she later told me, about other people and what they were like. One day Lisa got off the couch and began "to do." She became one of the most productive students in the school. A more controversial illustration (controversial between the older day kids and the older boarding kids) was over the late sleeping-in of the latter. They often would not emerge until late morning, sometimes not until afternoon. Again Dick generally stuck to his policy of letting that be, meanwhile striving to encourage them to realize their importance to the school and their responsibilities in the school to others.

These decisions, related to undoing, seemed in one sense to constitute a fall from free values, which includes such a strong commitment to community values. It seemed a fall in the direction of individualist consumer-oriented values and so they could be construed. And thus they might seem a dilution in the goals of the program and seem to represent "compromise" in the pejorative sense. Yet, on balance, they seemed instead to serve to nurture the abused psyches of kids to a point where they were almost in every case able and willing to move positively in new learning directions. These calculated decisions often worked--paid off--in terms of growth.

2. A similar example is offered by the following event at the Soule School in Freeport, the open component in the Freeport elementary system that was introduced in the fall of 1971. It was a not untypical crisis for the school occasioned by the discovery by a parent of figures of nude bodies which had been drawn on the walls of the toilet. This news spread through the town rapidly and seemed to reinforce a growing suspicion that the school was messy, undisciplined and downright rowdy.

Joyce Hopkins the principal met the problem in the following manner. She called a meeting of the older kids. She pointed out the pressures coming in from the Superintendent, the School Board and town gossip. She emphasized the concern of many parents. The kids started talking about it, with her, with one another. She asked them to think of ways out., Many options were discussed. Finally the group resolved the question in favor of putting bikinis on the naked bodies, the suggestion for this coming from the kids.

This was, or seemed to be, on the point of becoming, a distributive situation pure and simple. It was turned, however, into a growing one for the kids and for the school, and for Joyce Hopkins. What was done was a compromise. Yet it served growth; compromise was an indistinguishable part of that experience. The way it was done was consistent with the letter and spirit of the school, the open belief-style of Soule.

3. This example, and the one following, are offered to show situations where compromise wears its other, distributive, face. Distributive elements and calculations are so uppermost that they re-shape, or blunt, or dilute the style of growth and change which had been intended, causing it to slip into modes not intended by the program. The result may be to cause it to decline prematurely into routinized and fairly lifeless patterns.

The intention may well be carefully to calculate the pluses and minuses of a decision in order that there may be a better chance for growth to take place "afterwards." But the relationship between the "afterwards" and the "enabling compromises" seems tangential or strained. There is a tendency for the leaders who calculate, or react to, distributive forces this intensely, to become so absorbed or caught up by them that they lose touch with the demands and dimensions of growth.

There are two dramatic, and dramatically different, manifestations of this, in the programs studied. In Freeport, the previously described liberals under the leadership of Pic Pettit, found themselves embroiled in a polarized situation, partly of their own making. They were locked in a bitter power struggle with a coalition of teachers, administrators and townspeople. They broke out of that by suspending some basic aspects of their beliefs, especially in open-ness and talking things out. They pushed hard with abrasive distributive means to accomplish the removal of the school administration. They did accomplish this but created a situation, which though now rife with possibility, was also heavy with reaction and suspicion.

The new administrators took over in that context. They developed new programs consistent with the spirit of the original aims of the Pettit Board, and then sought to preserve them in the face of the old opposition.

They succeeded at the elementary level with respect to the Reading Program and the Open School component, but not at the middle school or the high school.

Another way of saying this is that, in the actions of the Pettit Board, the ends and means got split apart quite radically. They held on to their ends to change the system. Yet these ends were intensified or became "ideologized" (a set of principles or concepts lodged in the head) as the Board came into contact with the inertia of the system. The means that they had wanted to employ, such as talking things out with all concerned parties, were originally very integrally a part of their aims--i.e. a more open system and style throughout. But these, by the "logic" of the gradual polarization of forces, had to be compromised radically.

Other means came to be used instead--less open, more propagandistic and manipulative, more aggressive. This affected even the ordering of ends. Shaking the system, clearing away the obstacles, now became paramount, as over against getting on with new programs. This had to be done in order that space could be won to fulfill the aims...later on. Indeed that space was won. A new team of administrators entered that space. But it was now very vulnerable to the mobilized and angry forces of the opposition. In the following chapter we will see how the new team (with the prodding and help of the Pettit Board in the two years they had left before their removal through elections) used and defended that space and made it last through time. Here was compromise, though not in the sense we ordinarily think of it. Common sensically we think of compromise as "giving in" to the opposition, or of smoothing things over, of blunting the edges. But common sense is overly fact-oriented, not change oriented. In the example given we see compromise of something--of aims, and a style of action commensurate with those aims. Consequently we see the aims threatened in practice but salvaged nevertheless "at the last minute" through bold and aggressive action. This is not to imply that in that situation the aim of bringing basic change to the system could have been accomplished in any other way.

4. In Brunswick, the leaders for change (especially change in the form of the proposed new Jordan Acres School) pursued what seemed a defensive style, by contrast to the Pettit Board's aggressive style in Freeport. There was soft-pedaling of how great the change was going to be. Soothing

words like flexible were brought out at meetings with townspeople. A bright and conservative-appearing young man of native stock, Dick Crosman, was chosen to be principal. The six team leaders--kindergarten through fifth grade--were selected on the basis of their steady outlook and administrative capability--though the other criteria were assumed to be there too; that is, teaching ability and commitment to the new venture. The instructions to the principal and the school generally were to keep a tight rein at the beginning, to make sure things were ship-shape, to be cautious about seeming disorder and noise, etc., and then to allow gradual loosening as things were well under control.

Whether this posture was a function of defensive response to outside political forces; or to a control-and-command oriented administrative superstructure; or to the habit of administrators to want to deal with all parts of the system evenly; or a combination of all of these--the result was to dilute, and to a degree stymie, the impulses for basic change.

These impulses were marked in a substantial number of the 18 teachers and six aides at Jordan Acres, some of whom were closer to an achievement-centered belief-style and others to an open belief-style. They probably represented a majority of the twenty-four. They had all volunteered to teach at Jordan Acres, moving over to that school from other schools in the Brunswick elementary system. The tendencies towards an open belief-style were early on held in abeyance (the policy of a careful beginning), then "came out" or were allowed to appear in various ways, but gradually were toned down.

Individual instances of open education remained but became idiosyncratic--the expression of such and such a teacher's experimentation from time to time. Achievement-centered concerns grew paramount. These in turn were overlaid by continuing pressure from a control-oriented school administration. The elementary supervisor, Barbara Kurz, maintained a careful check on the school. Her intention was to encourage a more vital education, though she understood this more in the achievement-centered sense than in an open school way. This intention was consistently overlaid by an administrative anxiety and an administrative code of control that seems deeply imbedded in the structure of the Brunswick school administration. This anxiety and concern for orderly control communicated itself to the Jordan Acres School and caused its aims, in practice, gradually to lose much of their original elan. The need to compromise seemed to take over from the need to sustain and fulfill the aims--though it is true that the aims had never been as change-oriented as those at Freeport. Thus it seems that in spite of her intention, Barbara Kurz's actions tended to erode the pace and depth of change.

In both of these cases (Freeport and Brunswick) overriding distributive concerns seemed inevitably present. In the case of Freeport it may be argued, however, that the gradual absorption by the Pettit Board into a distributive action and outlook was largely a function of the inertial situation facing them and the consequent depth of the rebellion they experienced. By contrast, it may be argued, that in Brunswick, the situation, by the leaders, was not felt to be so incorrigible or frustratingly inertial. The rebellion was less. Emulative impulses were stronger. The already established "establishment" tended to be the major guide and director of the reforms--rather than the minority of educators and parents who wanted a "new way." Jordan Acres was pulled into the rest of the elementary system. It was not treated as a separate alternative component in the system as was Soule School in Freeport.

Compromise wears a double face. It is necessary for the practitioner, and for the researcher, to monitor practice carefully, to study and become aware of the context in which compromise is occurring. In that sense it is necessary to wait upon practice, to see what it reveals, and to take action accordingly depending on whether compromise represents a dilution or an optimization of the potentialities for change and growth.

Chapter Seven

Strategy

Strategy is a composition of many elements. All together and singly they vitally intersect with other sets of factors described in preceding and succeeding chapters. Of these, consciousness, leadership style, and pattern of organization seem especially important to the development of a successful strategy.

I have differentiated seven elements or aspects of strategy.

First an important aspect of strategy is an awareness that you need a strategy, and a correlative awareness that an absence of strategy is also like having one--the strategy being not to have one. This discovery came late to the Pettit Board in Freeport. An early "absence" of strategy also to a degree characterized the leadership at Collins Brook School. The thought seemed to be to forge ahead, let our commitment govern us and shine through in our actions, but let's not get embroiled in "political" considerations of planned strategies of "getting there from here."

The Pettit Board, once embroiled "willy nilly" in bitter conflict, eventually found and carried out a strategy--the removal of the school administration. They came to a point where they felt it was either that or it was giving up on their leadership and accepting defeat. Their earlier "non-strategy" had taken the form of hitting out at perceived or felt "evils" in the system wherever they occurred and of passionate insistence that the staff do something about it. This proved abortive, polarization occurred, a wall between them and the teachers and town appeared, and they then had recourse to a conscious strategy.

At Collins Brook School, there was initially much reliance on spontaneity, and much less reliance on working out, in advance, ways and means, or general designs, to effectuate the direction they wanted to move in. This "absence of strategy" caught up with them in the third year of operations when, as related in previous chapters, there occurred a combination of several things: a sudden expansion in the number of the "older kids" (anti-academic and anti-authoritarian boarding teenagers); a correlative intake of strong-minded staff with ideas for the school and with personal syndromes in some cases that emphasized values of community above that of school, sought spontaneity or democracy above that of leadership, and who exhibited an inclination toward individualistic modes of relating.

This caused multiple conflicts, and a crisis of confidence, that almost brought the school down. As a result the leadership entered on a new course. Dick Watson and his administrative assistant Joyce Friedman spent much time the rest of that year spelling out the meaning of their newly focused belief that "this was a school first;" that such and such qualities and capabilities are wanted in staff; and that such and such is the way in which roles and functions are demarcated, and so forth. In addition, greater "space"was created for the development of common rules relating to drugs, physical safety, and the general manners of the school/community.

It may be argued that much of the trauma of the third year for CBS was a function of having had no clear-cut strategy. There had been a general intention apparently to have the school grow from "the bottom," and thus to limit the intake of older youth until the first generation at CBS had themselves become teenagers. The idea seemed an exciting one to the parents whose kids of 5--9 began the school--and it seemed to be working out well during the first two years. New values of relating and learning were catching hold. An ethos was evolving. But the sudden intake in the third year of many teen-age youth--unused to the ways of a free school in a school-community--tended to shatter this emerging ethos. I am not satisfied that I have discovered the reason for this sudden shift. I attribute it partly to the strategy of "an absence of strategy," which may have caused the original intention to be "forgotten."

A second important aspect of strategy for change, after an acknowledgement that you have one and/or need a better one, is the need to unite the power of persons in formal, authorizing, roles with the power of persons capable of informal, or "grass roots," or galvanic, creative activity. These latter tend to occupy more ordinary or operational roles in a system. In this manner one can best hope to make a substantive *structural* impact: through the power of offices you affect *roles* and how they are ordered; and through the power to re-define meanings (power which tends to be present to a large degree in galvanic persons), you affect *relationships*, and meanings in general.

This is illustrated most clearly in the Freeport elementary system. It concerns the origin, development, and creation of two new programs, the Reading Program and the open school at Soule. In both programs there occurred a uniting of the leadership of the new elementary supervisor, Marcia Keith with change-oriented, growth-imbued, people in the system: Sally Vogel, who was primary catalyst for, and leader of, the new Reading Program; and both Mim Sheppard and Joyce Hopkins, teachers who were catalysts for the birth of an open school program at Soule elementary in South Freeport.

It must be noted that Keith's style of leadership did not occur in a vacuum, since it was given a green light (allowed to be--and encouraged) by the new Superintendent. This in turn was partly a function of the pressures from a still persistent Pettit Board. Yet her leadership was a major factor in a tense situation among the teachers, a tenseness that existed as a result of the polarizing trauma of the great fight the previous spring.

She used the powers of her office both to unite with new growing points in the system (Sally Vogel on the Reading Program and Mim Sheppard on the open school) and simultaneously--

by insisting on the professional solidarity of all the teachers--to stabilize the environment sufficiently so that the new programs could find the space to grow. This in turn led to change and growth in the entire elementary system.

This leads in the third place to a related aspect of strategy already touched on in the preceding. It is the ability to deal distributively with negative or potentially negative factors in a manner which stabilizes those factors. One thus permits, and preserves, the space in which new things can grow. One combines this with a willing responsiveness, an act of uniting with, "grass roots" energies for change.

To fill this out in detail for Keith's leadership would require a full treatment of the various tactics she employed in pursuit of this strategy; such as the gradual way in which she moved away from customary tracking; her winning of autonomy from the Pettit Board while retaining their respect; her fierce protectiveness of her teachers no matter what their outlook or capability; and her reliance on a leadership style of long meetings to talk things out. But the strategical pattern she was following is clear and instructive. It reveals a complex intermingling of distributive and of growth decisions and events, to a point where from one angle the leadership may seem calculative and instrumental and from another angle spontaneous and substantive.

To sum up these two related aspects of strategy: it is to create on the one hand a union of the power of office and the power of galvanic grass roots creativity, and on the other to effectuate a stabilized situation in the environment within which this union of forces can move towards the realization of new programs.

By contrast, an experience from the Jordan Acres school may be related. There the principal, Dick Crossman, became interested--in the second year of the new venture and one that would prove to be his last--in an effort to introduce cross grading. This would fulfill one of the original aims of the program. He began by working with the established hierarchy of the six team leaders. At a group meeting with them, they brought up many objections. He got the impression of lack of interest or support and withdrew the proposal. Later, and too late, he discovered great interest in cross grading among several of the more innovative teachers in the various teams (people who correspond to my concept, introduced above, of galvanic person in a non-authoritative role). In retrospect he realized he could have found substantial support for the proposal among them. It is not unlikely, had he initially looked for and found such support, and encouraged it, he might have been able to move the hierarchy of team leaders on the issue. The latter were by no means monolithic, though the meetings of the team leaders tended to be dominated by the two or three more conservative, well established and assertive team leaders. Dick Crossman's experience on this matter strongly confirmed my own researches and observations conducted during the preceding year in Jordan Acres. The hierarchy of relationships, the dominance of conservative commanding personalities, and the minority of galvanic persons were all clearly in evidence during the first year of its operation.

Such an example, as provided by Crossman's abortive effort, offers counterpoint only. It is not meant as a negative judgment on Dick Crossman's leadership as such. He was only following the rules of oeganizational SOP that are heavily in vogue in the Brunswick school system and which are not infrequently invoked to keep people administratively "in line." Things tend to move from the top down, though of course maximum input is invited (deeply encouraged according to the rhetoric) from the lower echelons. Lateral and informal processes of communication that might affect decision making, or collegial interchanges irrespective of role, are discouraged, if not frozen out. There is a prevailing and exaggerated jealousy of one's administrative prerogatives--it characterizes the entire system from top to bottom.

Even before the Jordan Acres school opened in September, 1972, and after he had been on the job about eight weeks, Dick Crossman was reprimanded for failing to follow "the chain of command." He had engaged one day with others, including principals in other buildings, in a spirited discussion of things they could do together. He immediately received a peremptory letter from the acting Superintendent, Ronald Snyder, which ended, "I think it is unfortunate to break any chain of command in the process of arriving at decisions." Ironically, Snyder has been one of the few progressively inclined administrators in the Brunswick system.

My extended interview with Snyder in the ensuing year was strongly counter to the spirit and intent of his letter to Crossman. In his interview he expressed a strong desire to encourage lateral exchange and to get beyond concern for roles as such. The constraints of the actual job on him seemed far too powerful to permit in practice the flexibility and interaction he seemed deeply to want.

In any event Crossman "got the message." He dealt with Jordan Acres as he had been dealt with. He followed the "chain of command." He was the conduit for orders from above and he in turn moved from the top down within his school. The kind of strategy employed by Marcia Keith to effectuate real change in Freeport was lost in the arts of "efficient administration." It was never thought of. The real politics (strategy) of change was totally overborne by the myth of administrative chain of command.

This example from Brunswick, and other data in the programs, uggest a fourth important aspect of strategy--the need to ssess whether to move "across the board;" or to select growing oints that may have gathered around a critical problem or ossibility at the grass roots; and having made the selection, o invoke the two preceding aspects of strategy stated above. strategy of moving "across the board" would seem to be appropriate or plausible only if one is in the midst of, or is illing to invite and able to sustain, situations of revoluionary ferment and confusion. It is to this perception of the situation that the Pettit Board came in Freeport in the spring of 1970 when they decided "to clear the deck."

A fifth aspect, closely related to the fourth, is to make a distinction between short-term actions, that are designed to meet immediate problems, and long-term actions that are designed to have a more systemic effect--and to do both as effectively as possible. To do only the first tends to decline into "band aid" or piecemeal politics. You don't build towards an overall structural change--one is so immersed in the details of improving this or that aspect of a hydra-headed problem that you don't use your forces economically and incrementally to achieve a larger systemic effect. To a degree this began early to bog down Upward Bound leadership.

To do only the second--long-term actions--tends to decline into an appearance initially of spinning wheels and a tendency to over-design change so that by the time you are ready to move you try for everything at once; consequently you have too many logistical problems; too much has to be assimilated and put into practice at once; and there is perforce too much reliance too soon on too many who are unprepared or lukewarm or both. People have not been permitted to "move there from here" through progressively learning situations. This tended to be what happened in Freeport middle school under the strong leadership of Al Beaudoin. He had a truly systemic orientation but he didn't build "there from here" with a series of smaller changes that would effectively complement the planning process he invoked on "the big change."

The both/and approach (both short and long term actions) is illustrated in Keith's leadership in Freeport elementary. She immediately made a modest change in the tracking system when she took over in September, 1970, as an important short-term action. Starting in October, she made/received contacts with galvanic persons, encouraging them to move, thus starting a process that led to the planning, ratification and implementation, by the following year, of the new Reading Program and Soule open school. At the same time she began discussions and planning sessions with all the teachers that led to the abandonment of tracking the following spring.

A sixth aspect is directly related to that element in consciousness (referred to in Chapter Five) which perceives the relational character of all things--especially that a change in one part provokes compensatory changes of one kind or another in another part of the social field one is concerned about. One is well advised to be on the watch for the latent as well as the manifest compensatory reactions and reverberations likely to be evoked by a move in a given direction. Since often it is "the tip of the iceberg" that one sees initially (the latent factors showing themselves only as the move is made) a necessary part of strategy is to be prepared for "the unexpected," both pluses and minuses, that come into view as a project develops in practice.

Overplanning will thus defeat you. Armed with your plans you will be too anxious about "the unexpected." You will not be poised to roll with the punch, or to take advantage of a new factor in the situation which you may be able to interact with to produce a stronger momentum in your project.

This aspect of strategy may be called the feedback factor, but only if its correlative is clearly understood to be a relational consciousness (consciousness of the relational, interactive, nature of all things). In the context of a relational consciousness, feedback acquires a potency for growth. In its absence it tends to foster defensive, or manipulative, types of action whose end is distributive success and not growth as such.

But the chief point I want to make about the feedback factor in strategy is the consequent importance of always moving in a structural direction. Another way of saying this is to focus energy, to fight against its dissipation into other or parallel and disparate channels. When you have something going, don't assume its going to "go" just because its going. It needs careful tending, careful marshalling of forces to keep it growing. It needs therefore both to respond to latent forces as they show themselves (both within and without the program) and to differentiate itself clearly from what it is not, i.e., from forces that are different, or lukewarmly opposed, or competitive, or hostile.

In a word, a program needs on the one hand to interact with the environment of forces that are inevitably in a relational situation with the program, and on the other it needs to differentiate itself (to itself) clearly as a newly growing structure. This is as true of a wholly new venture such as Collins Brook School as it is true of ventures that are to a greater or less degree sub-structures within a larger organizational whole--such as Upward Bound at Bowdoin, Soule School in Freeport, the Reading Program in Freeport elementary system, and Jordan Acres in Brunswick.

The order in which I have put these four sub-structural programs is deliberate--it is a descending order of structural autonomy and identification within the larger whole; from greater to less autonomy and differentiation.

The case of the last named one, Jordan Acres, is instructive. Part of the original intention of Brunswick innovators was to develop an alternative mode of education at Jordan Acres, one which would be a catalyst for change throughout the system, both vertically and horizontally. Sound efforts were made in this direction--the physical layout of the school featured an absence of walls; teachers were asked to volunteer for the new school and 27 did of whom 18 were chosen; there was considerable pre-planning and orientation by the six 3-person teams, including summer workshops--though this crucial dimension had been cut back from six to three weeks by an economy-minded Board.

But strategic decisions were being made which undercut these promising efforts at differentiation, inner and outer responsiveness, and feedback. First, on the grounds that the busing problem was intractable, the school was not put on a voluntary basis. This meant that some who wanted to attend a school like Jorden Acres could not, and that many more who felt cautious or lukewarm or fearful were forced to have their children attend. This was an important factor sanctioning caution in the administration of the school and sanctioning an effort to have it seem that Jorden Acres was like any other school in the system, basically.

Secondly, the effort by Superintendent Gallagher, during his brief and stormy tenure, to introduce the concept of "differentiated staffing" turned out in practice to mean the replication of hierarchy. The six team leaders who were chosen became the group with whom the principal worked in the school, and, as already noted, three of the six were assertive and tended to the conservativ in their educational and administrative behavior and outlook.

Thirdly, the principal was hired only "at the last minute," on July 1, 1972, just two months before the new venture was to begin. He had not had time to work with the staff; or have a part in their selection; or have time to be introduced to and assimilate the hopes and aims that at that time were very high for the school--hopes and aims that emphasized the themes of "a new beginning."

Fourth, the venture was "sold" to the town at various meetings, but especially in a well rehearsed meeting in June of 1972, as something not all that different from the other parts of the elementary system. As already noted in earlier chapters, the soothing word "flexible education" was used again and again. The impression was left that Jorden Acres, far from being a pilot project, or a venture in a new direction, was instead only a minor but interesting variation in the standard pattern of education in the town.

Fifth, the administrators themselves, principal, elementary supervisor, and superintendent, tended to put Jordan Acres in the same administrative and educational categories as any of the schools in their jurisdiction. What was supposed to fit one should be applicable equally to all. In the name of standard operating procedures and administrative fairness Jordan Acres became indistinguishable from any other unit in the system. In practice it was not differentiated, though in rhetoric it continued to be talked about as something special.

Sixth, and finally, the problem of numbers made the strategy of change at Jordan Acres seem virtually mindless. The open-structured school received well over 600 students, an average of over 100 students for each of six "pods" as they were called (K through 5). Each pod has three teachers and an aide and part-time secretarial help. The largeness of the groups (no matter how ingenious the efforts of the teams to relieve the pressure of numbers) and the absence of physical walls made the school "more noisier," as someone put it, than was sometimes tolerable. This was an added strain on the teachers and on the principal. They found themselves trying to "lean over backwards" not to mind the noise and yet again and again acting in ways that dampened real activity in the name of keeping the noise down.

The moral energy, of which there was considerable in the Jordan Acres program, was sapped by inner and outer forces such as these. Its identity and distinctiveness as a structurally new program were submerged. Feedback, responsiveness to inner and outer challenges to growth, tended to languish. Or when it appeared, it tended either to be re-worked into administrative patterns, or to be allowed some space as only the individual expression of this or that individual teacher's creative imagination.

Finally, as an important aspect of strategy, there is the problem of communication. Communication happens whether it is willed and guided or not. Images of the person, and of the role the person is seen to occupy, are communicated whether this is willed by that person or not. It was noted under consciousness that awareness of how one is being perceived as a person and in a given role is a critically important element. The use of this factor is an important aspect in the strategy of change, and anti-change.

Persons, and persons in roles, are themselves vehicles of communication and change. They can, for example, help to mediate discontinuities noted in Chapter One. The choice of Joyce Hopkins to be head teacher at Soule, open school in Freeport, though a "natural" one since she was already established there, was nevertheless a highly useful one for the project. She was allowed (by Marcia Keith who tactfully, politically, got out of the way publicly as much as possible even while she worked doubly hard administratively to shore up the project) to become more and more the image of the school in the community. Joyce had been a traditional teacher, who had been a loyal member of the Teachers Association in their struggle against the Pettit Board. She therefore had credibility with both the mainstream of teachers and the mainstream of Freeport citizens. But though she had been a traditional teacher, she had undergone over a period of several years, a profound inner change in her approach and attitude towards the meaning of the teaching relationship. She had evolved towards an open set of beliefs. Thus in addition to being an effective leader in the school (though some demurred because they felt she too much lacked organizational efficiency), she was also an effective factor of communication on behalf of the new program *vis-à-vis* the rest of the system and the townspeople. Thus, not because of what she overtly did by way of communicating to the town (some felt she could have done much more of that; and in fact she did very little) but because her very image as a person (the language of her person) mediated between the new open world of Soule and the established world of Freeport with its traditionalist and/or achievement-centered concerns.

It is important to note that the impact of the Hopkins image was generally distributive in nature (it provided a defense for the new program). Yet it also did to a degree provide some mediatory basis for mutual learning between adherents of contrasting, conflicting, belief-styles. Here we have a sense in which language (through a person) may soften the harder edges of discontinuities and help interpret, in this case, what is seen and felt to be oh so true and right by protagonists of the open way into terms that can be apprehended by those who are deeply attached to opposite beliefs. Such a type of communication I choose to call symbols of transformation: meaning that where two different systems occur (cultures, mind-sets, belief-styles), language is found to mediate--transform--what is seen and felt in one system into the experience of those in the other. I have discussed this at greater length in the last chapter of Part One.

Where the aim and the follow-through is specifically distributive, there the language is propaganda. Where the aim and follow-through is also to achieve a learning and listening effect, the language is in the mode of education. There seems to have been a mix of both in the case of Joyce Hopkins at Soule.

The choice of Dick Crossman to be principal at Jordan Acres in Brunswick was animated by the desire to find the figure of a person who was native, gave off an aura of stability and common sense, and was competent and committed to change. In practice the language of his person suggested more a stability orientation than change orientation.. It is possible that the role he was placed in; the expectations about his role (many of them conflicting) that came at him from many sides; and his own strong predispositions to do the right things for his career--combined and conspired to bend the language of his person away from education and towards propaganda. The system used him to shield itself from threat of external attack and, perhaps, from too much internal change.

Chapter Eight

Patterns of Organization

How roles are formally organized, how in fact power is authoritatively distributed, is a vital part of structure and interacts intimately with leadership, strategy, and belief-styles.

Two sets of criteria seem compelling in any organizational pattern. The first set is degree of reciprocity versus degree of linear command, the latter understood either as coming from the top down or from the bottom up. Reciprocity is understood here to consist of interactional authority relationships; that is, a pattern of organization in which separate wills, though related, must encounter one another as relatively autonomous and legitimately autonomous equals.

The second set is degree of transparency versus degree of mystification. Transparency means a structure whose roles and their interrelationships are clearly perceived and appropriated by the consciousness of the persons enacting the structure. Roles and their interrelationships (*i.e.*, who performs what, when, where, how, and why) are as they appear to be; they appear to be as they are; and they are acknowledged to be such by members of the structure. Any existing structure, no matter how successful in this direction, attains only a relative degree of transparency; it requires constant human *action* (meaning choice for transparency) to move in that direction or to sustain high levels of transparency. There is a counter-tendency towards mystification, in which things are made to appear what they are not, and are not what they appear to be.

Reciprocity means relationships in which the person in his or her role is both acting upon others and being acted on in return. There is an implication of separate and relatively autonomous wills among persons in roles of relatively equal status. Collegial peer relationships are emphasized and decisions are reached through lateral collegial interaction. Between levels of generality (say from work teams to school-wide, or bureau-wide, responsibility, from this again to system-wide responsibility) there is also a spirit and process of interaction and assumption of mutually interdependent but autonomous wills in the reaching and making of decisions.

In the linear command style, on the other hand, there is little if any lateral collegiality in reaching and making decisions at any level; and between levels there predominates the chain of command, either from the top down, as seems usually to be the case, or (sometimes theoretically and then to a degree in practice) from the bottom on up.

Reciprocity and linear command are counter tendencies.

The general relationship between these two sets of reciprocity/linear command and of transparency/mystification may be set forth as follows. Reciprocity tends to find support from transparency, and vice versa; and linear command tends to be more compatible, or go hand in hand, with mystification.

I differentiate eight models of organization.

1. *Tyrannical*, or *arbitrary* -- This occurs when the linear command style has reached its ultimate degree and likewise mystification has become total, or nearly so. We usually associate this with rigid, dictatorial, despotic rule from the top down. However, it may also manifest itself as mob rule from the bottom. In either case, differentiation is obliterated, structure is made the plaything of aimless forces, policy seems the function of whimsical moods and power considerations simply, and the people are each one spiritually isolated from every other.

2. *Anarchic* -- Here there is a sharp rebellion against linear command and mystification, and it therefore often appears as the absence of these two characteristics rather than as a definite tendency towards the realization of structural reciprocity and transparency. Yet the anarchic mode has always (especially in its theoretical formulations) emphasized the self-responsibility of each towards every other one; and it has emphasized the greater importance of persons over that of roles, relying on spontaneity to accomplish necessary tasks and to arrive at timely decisions. This latter implies a high degree of conscious effort at transparency in human relations. Action is at a premium.

This mode requires very special conditions and it requires people who are willing to expend the time in "inter-personal politics" necessary to make this "transcendence of forms" work well.

3. *Democratic* -- This mode, in the egalitarian form that has usually been associated with its name, is a combination of linear command and of a tendency towards transparency. The will is located at "the bottom" and expresses itself as command to those in the authoritative offices "at the top" entrusted with fulfilling the intention of that command. There is full publicity and clear identification of what are the powers and duties of those who are to carry out the people's will. The democratic is vulnerable to mystification-- the tendency is for those at the top to form elites and to rule over the people in the name of the people.

4. *Constitutional*, or *Interactive* -- As in the anarchic, this mode breaks decisively with the theory and practice of linear command. But, by contrast to the anarchic, it clearly identifies and differentiates roles, and it clearly demarcates levels of generality with respect to decision making. Collegiality within and between levels is strongly sought for. There is also an emphasis on transparency.

But both reciprocity and transparency are sought within the limits imposed by differentiation of roles and the demarcations in levels of generality. This makes the problem of communication more difficult, since there is less directness, less spontaneity (more doing things "according to Hoyle") than in the anarchic mode. There is a balance struck in the constitutional mode between spontaneity and rigidity which affects and limits the degree to which reciprocity and transparency can be attained.

5. Charismatic -- Here an intuitive relationship exists between leader and follower. There is little lateral collegiality--though there is a sense in which the leader in a comradely way interacts with intimates who share a pedestal with him. There is however a degree of reciprocity between the leader and the follower, whereby both are constrained by what they (intuitively) share in common; e.g., a passionate commitment to common goals, even though the goals remain fairly general.

On the other hand, the charismatic relationship puts much less emphasis on transparency. It prefers to feel its way rather than look more closely at relationships and roles. It is highly vulnerable to mystification on the part both of leader and follower. There is much effervescence and less sober exchange of data and analyses. The will of the follower is too readily constrained by the seeming "goodness of the cause",symbolized in the leader; and the leader is too readily misled by the loyalty and adulation of the follower.

The charismatic mode is better at giving birth or rebirth to organization than to sustaining it, or to implementing goals.

6. Managerial -- The relationships in this mode are a diminution of constitutional relationships and seem to exist in a cross tendency between constitutional and bureaucratic or monarchical forms (see immediately below). There is give and take among equals at various levels of generality in the

organization. There is also a clear emphasis on efficient operations, and this usually means linear type decision making. This often takes the form of a dynamic person in an authoritative role who "takes charge" and gets on with the task at hand. In this sense personal qualities are emphasized as strongly as roles; but the trend is towards "doing it," taking "command." Hence interaction is clearly subordinated to fulfillment of task; and mystification is winked at in the interest of deploying the manipulative arts required "to get there from here" as expeditiously and swiftly as possible. One is not *too* nice about the legalities or other people's feelings (or rights). "Nice guys finish last."

7. *Bureaucratic**-- Here the emphasis shifts away from the managerial mode and towards hierarchic role definition in which the linear chain of command concept is strongly articulated. Roles are more important than persons. Processes are rationalized and made as predictable as possible. Problems are supposed to be handled in an objective manner in accordance with set procedures. Relationships are formalized and there is a sharp delineation and codification of powers, duties and tasks for each position in the hierarchy.

---

* Writings on bureaucracy are legion. Especially helpful to me have been Michel Crozier's *The Bureaucratic Phenomenon* (Chicago, 1964); Franz Schurmann's *Ideology and Organization in Communist China* (2nd Edition, Berkeley, 1968); Max Weber's various writings on bureaucracy; and Philip Selznick's *Leadership in Administration* (Evanston, Ill., and White Plains, N. Y., 1957).

The concept of reciprocity is strongly resisted; it smacks too much of deviation from the established norms; of personalizing and subjectivity; of jumping familiar, predictable, channels; and of inefficient time-consuming dialog and encounter among autonomous forces.

Is bureaucracy equally resistant to transparency? I came into this study believing that it was, though in a general way since I had not formulated the concept of transparency. I am now of the view that bureaucracy may be quite consistent with the principle of transparency, but that it has hitherto had a strong tendency towards mystification. If tasks are clearly formulated; if the roles that are created to accomplish these tasks are clearly demarcated; if no special privilege or unequal status or disproportionate emolument, or continuous access to prior information inheres in a role; and if this identification of tasks, and demarcation of roles, and correlative specification of competence is obvious to everyone, and accepted and acknowledged by everyone; then one may say that the direction of the organization, and of the structure as a whole, is towards transparency. Under these circumstances bureaucracy might be seen to fulfill itself and to become truly an effective instrument for the attainment of rational and human goals. The process is not as exciting, or as invigorating or as generative of the human virtue of action as, for example, constitutional or even managerial modes, to say nothing of the democratic or anarchic modes. But it is a style that enables administrative work to be done that requires competence and aptitudes of various kinds--work which citizens, laymen, "rank and file" members of human structures (be they professors or machinists or artists) often find boring, or an unconscionable time-consuming interference in the (to them) far more creative and substantive work they want to do. It is a style which enables administrative work to be done by specialists without these specialists becoming an alienating force in the structure oppressing laymen, citizen or so-called "rank and file" member of the structure.

But bureaucratic transparency requires a high degree of consciousness to meet even the criteria listed above, and those are probably not all. It is a high ideal. The human species may yet graduate to that level. In certain times and places it may be a style that is attainable by a structure of small scale, and these will show the way. Bureaucratic transparency also requires a relative absence of dualities-in-conflict (actual or potential) described in the first chapter of Part Two. Socially inspired contradictions, especially class and sex role contradictions, create administrative situations in which the seemingly objective code or procedure or chain of command often becomes a facade behind which unresolved and perhaps unresolvable conflict takes place (unresolvable, that is, through objective rational bureaucratic norms and processes). Indeed the seeming objectivity of the process is an additional reinforcing factor in the conflict itself and in the often resulting oppression of the weaker, the poorer, and the passive in the interest of the stronger, the richer and the aggressive force. Thus hypocrisy abounds. But the hypocrisy is covered over, or layered over, by the myth of "unpolitical administration." The myth is a mystification that imprisons and impoverishes the consciousness of administrators and rank and file members of the structure alike. Mystification so overlays the bureaucracy that, if unchecked, it may well approach the arbitrary, tyrannical pattern described first above.

8. Monarchical -- This is the apotheosis of the linear chain of command style of organization. In the earlier stages of a developing structure the pattern may well be charismatic. There is the adored leader and his or her many loyal executors and administrators of his or her commands. Sooner or later, however, administration becomes regularized and a bureaucratic form of organization grows up "underneath" the monarchical role and person.

A reverse movement may also occur. That is, a bureaucratic type of organization may evolve out of any of the organizational modes described in this chapter and then in turn it may establish at the tip of the hierarchical pyramid a monarchical office or ruling stratum.

There seems to be an intimate relationship between the bureaucratic mode as hitherto practiced and the monarchical mode of organization. The chain of command seems to require "an ultimate source" if only in the guise of super buck-stopper at the top; conversely the chief(s) seem to require a chain of command leading from top to bottom in order to effectuate his or her or their purposes.

There is a singular lack of emphasis on either reciprocity or on transparency in the monarchic (bureaucratic) or bureaucratic (monarchic) mode of organization. Of all the legitimate forms of organization it would seem the one most vulnerable to arbitrary and tyrannical rule.

In practice we find these various modes of organization combined as already indicated just above in the description of the monarchic mode. In addition to the mixture of the bureaucratic and the monarchic, the constitutional and the bureaucratic often are mixed, as are the anarchic and the bureaucratic, as are the constitutional and the democratic, or the constitutional and the monarchic. Some mixtures are more stable than others, some fit together better than others--all seem to be moving in one direction or another, even if in a zigzag way, now more to one side, now more to the other. It is not always easy to measure what pattern is really being followed by a given structure or sub-structure at a certain time.

In the following I try to estimate the predominent organizational patterns and directions of the programs under review in this study.

Freeport

The Pettit Board broke through an entrenched bureaucratic, quasi-monarchical, and highly routinized pattern of administrative operation. In this they did more than "a clearing of the deck," more than a replacement of four top administrators (Superintendent, Elementary Supervisor and two principals) by four others. They broke with the received, established pattern of organization itself. For a time in the spring of 1970 and on into the summer, and even to a degree persisting on into the new academic year when the new team took over, the Pettit Board took on the role of administrators themselves. In this they operated in a fairly free-flowing charismatic manner. This was to a degree, firmly but effectively, resisted by the new team, especially Cartmill and Keith (the new superintendent and elementary supervisor respectively).

Thus gradually a new pattern, somewhat mixed in character emerged. The charismatic mode was replicated in the middle school and high school until the removal of their respective "Pettit Board principals" in the spring of 1972, by the anti-Pettit Board which had just succeeded to power. Thereafter a quasi-bureaucratic, quasi-managerial mode evolved in the middle school and a more or less bureaucratic style returned to the high school.

The superintendency on the other hand, under the leadership of Bob Cartmill, after successfully resisting the more charismatic incursions of the Pettit Board, developed a quasi-constitutional, quasi-managerial relationship both with them and within the system overall. With the accession of Bud Fillmore to leadership of the School Board in 1972 the style and mode of operations became more managerial, both for the Board and for the superintendency. This tended to become a predominant general pattern in the system--with, however, charismatic overtones now and then emanating from the Board; with bureaucratic patterns re-emerging in the high school, to a degree in the middle school, and to a milder degree in the superintendency itself; and with a constitutional pattern strongly in force in the elementary system.

This last was primarily the accomplishment of Marcia Keith, but with timely assistance from Bob Cartmill, whose style of superintendency under successive Boards, poles apart from one another, provided a kind of cushion for the development of new patterns in the elementary system. Within and between the three schools of the elementary system, and in the relationships among teachers and principals throughout, there is a marked process of collegiality (reciprocity) and a marked degree of open decisions openly arrived at (transparency). Ironically, the elimination of the office of Elementary Supervisor by the Board in the spring of 1973, though intended as a slap at Marcia Keith (and perhaps an invitation for her to leave the system) had the effect of further increasing role reciprocity (as opposed to role hierarchy) in the elementary system. Keith decided to stay on as principal of the largest of the three schools, a role she had been filling hitherto along with that of Elementary Supervisor. Henceforth the three elementary principals were, from the point of view of role differentiation, on an equal par with one another. Keith, however, continued to play a leading role in this official group.

There are evidences in the elementary system of bureaucratic practices and of charisma, the latter emanating both from Marcia Keith and from Joyce Hopkins, the Soule School principal. However, these are mixed into a climate and pattern of organization which has begun to settle in a constitutional direction. The next chapter will deal more specifically with their style of leadership and that of Bob Cartmill.

Collins Brook School

Dick and Sharon Watson in the beginning seemed to be following a basically anarchic pattern in the conduct of relations at the school. This seemed to work in the early stages both because of the high enthusiasm and because, it being a school of only eight youngsters the first year and twelve to fifteen the second, there was correspondingly less emphasis on role differentiation and on specifying administrative tasks.

Even so, there occurred an incident at the start of the second year when an aggressive couple coming as visitors installed themselves in the school-community. Over a period of weeks they took advantage of the anarchic pattern of organization to a point where if Dick and Sharon had not made a stand, the running of the school would have been arrogated into this couple's helpful and willing hands. They took such a stand and the couple left. The Watsons' leadership and their charismatic intervention tipped the scales. So already at this early stage, the anarchic pattern was mixed with a strong element of charisma.

The incident was a straw in the wind. The events of the third year, already related in previous chapters, forced Dick's hand. Initially the charismatic element came sharply to the fore. Dick acted, too slowly for some, but when he did it was sharp and even--relative to those circumstances--heroic. But the pattern of leadership and administration thereafter could not be the same. A choice was encountered--either to go now with a fully charismatic pattern or to achieve greater objective articulation and definition of roles.

There ensued an interesting period in which Dick Watson and Joyce Friedland, an administrative assistant whom he had hired, tried to work out criteria and specifications for all the roles in the school--administrators, teachers, non-teaching staff members, visitors, and so forth--including to a degree expectations for little, middle, and older kids. This was a rationalizing process, in which there was much energy and excitement between Dick and Joyce who seemed never to be able to stop talking and consequently often "closed the door" to their small office. This aroused considerable resentment throughout the school, among teachers, students and staff.

In the meantime, during this period, Sharon Watson held herself aloof from this rationalizing process and in her own way resisted it to a degree. She affirmed her role as being more than a specific role. She saw herself as a facilitator, or intervenor, or trouble shooter or listener, or responder to the particular problems or successes of all the kids, and even in the school-community as a whole. In this she was partly reflecting the earlier anarchic principle. But since she also accepted much of the new specifications and criteria worked out by Dick and Joyce, she and the school seemed to be moving on towards a quasi-constitutional pattern of operation, mixed in with the newer bureaucratic elements and a still certain degree of charismatic leadership on the part both of Dick and of Sharon.

Since 1972, roles have become more formalized; but power continues to be shared; school meetings and staff meetings continue to be collegial experiences; and consciousness is high and seems to be coming more clarified. This suggests a pattern that is partly bureaucratic in a non-monarchical mode and partly constitutional, with the latter somewhat the stronger of the two.

There is projected for 1976 a merger of Herb Snitzer's free school at Lewis Woddhams in New York and Collins Brook School. Equipment, some personnel, and some students will move to Collins Brook. The plan is for Herb to lead in the upper school, Sharon to lead in the lower school, and for Dick to act as coordinator and overall administrator.

This confirms my estimate that the school, with a substantial degree of reciprocity and transparency, will continue to develop a quasi-constitutional and quasi-bureaucratic pattern of organization, the latter in a distinctly non-monarchical mode.

Upward Bound

A charismatic pattern was established early on in the program especially with the accession to leadership of Doris Vladimiroff. Her leadership as director of the program has undergone changes over the years but it remains consistently in a charismatic mode. In addition there has evolved a pattern of administration that is to a large degree bureaucratic, though with some limited elements that suggest constitutional relationships.

A staffing pattern has been worked out which emphasizes the employment of persons in staff and quasi-staff roles--especially in the dorms--who are graduates of the program, or are advanced students in the program. There has been a serious attempt made to identify roles and specify their tasks and to try to make these as clear in operation as possible. Mystifications have tended to creep in, partly because persons in and out of the roles don't like them, or aren't used to them, or take advantage of them; and partly because the Director, in a charismatic manner, intervenes at different points in the system of roles that has been worked out. In recent years, a deputy to the director has been added to the program. The first one chosen--a popular and leading graduate of Upward Bound--found the role frustrating and unpredictable in the face of the charismatic leader. The second one has won more space for his role. It remains in a chain of command situation, however, but with some intimations of give and take and of a measure of reciprocity. This pattern of organization (charismatic--bureaucratic) seems to fit the nature of the program as it has evolved--given its actual commitment in practice to achievement-oriented upward mobility and to creating an island of safety and curiosity building for kids unused to either. A stronger commitment in practice to consciousness raising concerning new values and a structurally improved society would probably require a more deliberately constitutional pattern of organization.

Brunswick

The pattern of organization in the Brunswick school system has over the years remained basically unchanged in a quasi-bureaucratic, quasi-monarchical pattern. The chain of command has always been, and remains, strongly in force, no matter whether the occupant of the superintendency is mild or forceful, manipulative or domineering, smooth or feisty.

In the "good old days" of superintendency, before teachers and school boards got themselves organized, the superintendent, it was commonly remarked, ran things pretty much out of his back pocket, with minimal input from teachers, parents, board members, or even taxpayers. The situation has changed and these latter forces have become much more organized and involved. Yet the basic structuring of power and command emanating from the superintendent's office downward through the system remains unaltered. The individual superintendent's position has become much more hazardous; tenure in office tends to be short and stormy; and life in the office is a constant struggle for survival. New talents of manipulation and the many machiavellian arts seem to be needed more and more--both to get things done and to preserve the prevailing monarchical/bureaucratic structure of power.

Mario Tonon, a forceful, confident and conservative administrator, lost the support of key moderates and liberals in 1968/9, both on the issues of discipline in the schools and his insistence on expanding an existing elementary school instead of building a wholly new--and different--one. There was also much dissatisfaction with his abrasive and sometimes peremptory administrative style. He was replaced by Erwin Gallagher in 1970. Gallagher didn't change the pattern of administration but he did push hard for reforms, and especially for the new elementary school at Jordan Acres. His pet innovations such as differentiated staffing and team teaching and sequential learning were worked into the new scheme. Barbara Kurz, whom he appointed Elementary Supervisor, and Ronald Snyder, whom he made his Assistant Superintendent, both were strongly committed to the reforms--and added their own ideas and philosophy to them, especially a belief in individualized instruction and better (more relaxed) staff relations. But they were locked into the prevailing chain of command concepts and practice.

Gallagher ran (predictably) into severe trouble with a new board, some members of whom resented his "habit of command" and his assertion of the complete autonomy of his role. He was almost literally hounded from office. Ron Snyder then received the nod but quit after a few months, primarily because he felt he would not be able to defend the autonomy and prerogatives of the superintendency. Nevertheless in his brief tenure, and earlier when he had been acting superintendent, he continued the basic monarchical/bureaucratic pattern of operations--though he did so, generally, in a far more relaxed manner than his predecessors. Similarly, Barbara Kurz, as Elementary Supervisor, fit herself into the command-oriented role.

Later, when Paul Brunelle took over the superintendency, the established pattern was stabilized. Relations with the board were smoothed over. Personality clashes, that had marred relations between Gallagher and some members of the Board, were past and gone. Brunelle and the Board generally saw eye to eye on policy matters. The locus of pressure now shifted to relations between the superintendent and the staff "downwards" through the principals and the teachers. In the spring of 1974, the principals at Longfellow elementary and at Jordan Acres were removed, somewhat summarily.

The following academic year (December/January, 1974/5) the teachers, through their local association, voted no confidence in Brunelle by a vote of 75--0 with one abstention. The Board, however, stood by Brunelle and reappointed him for two years.

The pressures are severe, but through it all the essential structural features of the system remain unchanged. As pointed out in previous chapters, the effect of a bureaucratic, chain-of-command system on the internal relations of administrators and teachers, teachers and teachers, teachers and students has been oppressive. It has been particularly oppressive on the program at Jordan Acres where the principles of openness and collegiality were part of the intention of the school. Insofar as there was and remains a will to translate this intention into daily practice it is in a state of contradiction with the prevailing pattern of administration.

In Freeport the entrenched bureaucratic pattern of administration was smashed in the spring of 1970. In the reconstruction that followed new patterns, more consistent with educational growth, took root. This has not happened in Brunswick.

Chapter Nine

Styles of Leadership

The following analysis as in previous chapters is a strongly structural one. Throughout this study, and decisively here, I regard as a fundamental of behavior that human beings, in pursuit of their activities, enact structures. They do so on a daily basis, creating roles, ordering roles in certain ways, expressing and defining relationships, and evolving meanings more or less consciously felt and communicated. People do this, changing over time, trying to survive and grow.

In this process, leadership is a critical factor. It is an especially critical factor when some human beings react to established patterns and try to intervene consciously in the flow of human structuring in order to bend it this way or that way or to make it proceed more effectively. What they do interacts with the other forces in the environment, or field of forces, that all together constitute the ongoing structure.

The four programs I studied yielded a considerable variety of leadership styles. But a certain dynamic pattern seems present along the following lines.

Change leadership has its roots in the dialectic of rebellion. The roots of rebellion lie in the felt contradictions, or dualities-in-conflict, in a given field of forces.

These contradictions become overt as new technologies and new perceptions of the human condition assert themselves. In the face of contradictions, established institutions find themselves on trial and must deal with contradictions in one fashion or another. Insofar as the attempt is made to defer or ignore or repress or defy contradictions, the worm of rebellion grows and gathers force. Rebellion, as stated in Chapter Two, usually begins in defiance, may evolve into emulation, and/or may move onward to the affirmation in practice of a new value.

The overall pattern of leadership may be described as two movements, or arcs of motion, as in the image of an arc of light moving on the night sky from one point on the horizon to another. I call them Movement I and Movement II.

Movement I begins in a rebellion-oriented, charismatic interruption of established institutions and ways. It tends to end in a return to "normalcy," a re-establishment of organizational behavior and of ways of relating that are "bureaucratic" and "ethos-bound" (*cf.* discussion in Chapters Four and Eight).

I call the first part of this Movement IA and the second part IB. I argue that IA tends of itself to invite IB, both because in the process of explosion there arises counter-forces strongly imbued with anti- feelings and counter-rebellion, and because the charismatic leadership may not itself have developed fully enough towards the affirmation in practice of new values. It may remain stuck in defiance or discover that emulative progress is enough.

Movement I is primarily and heavily distributive in its behavior. IA is strongly engaged in action in aggressive, lion-like, ways in order to correct what are seen to be great imbalances and injustices. There is a presumption that this will "clear the air," or remove the obstacles that stand in the way of allowing growth to take place. IB tends on the other hand, not to be aggressive, but supple, or fox-like. It is guided primarily by considerations of survival and both adopts and engenders, throughout the structure, a tendency towards a maintenance orientation. It trades on the belief that growth can only occur to the degree that these maintenance concerns are met and suitably corresponding ways of behavior are enacted. By persisting in this, IB may invite a new IA type of reaction.

We see that both IA (the elevation of "ends above all"--"the ethics of intention") and IB (the elevation of "means above all"--"the ethics of consequences") tend to tilt structural forces towards an embroilment with distributive concerns at the expense of growth concerns.

Movement II expresses a stronger, more intimate, uniting of distributive and growth factors. Towards one end of its arc, growth tends to over-shadow distributive concerns (I call this IIA); and towards the other end distributive concerns are weightier than concern for growth, and I call this IIB.

IIA, towards one end, is closer to charisma; and towards the other, shades off into IIB, which is managerial in character and concerned for a kind of efficient, incremental style of change. IIB at one end shades off into IIA: and at the other side becomes more like IB, the routinized, or bureaucratic, mode of leadership already noted.

IIA is strongly oriented towards reciprocity in roles and relationships, and moves towards situations of transparency (where people become more aware of, more acknowledging of, the structure of relationships enveloping them). It can be described as a constitutional style. IIA risks more than IIB does, but not so much as IA. IIA, of all the four types here distinguished, is the most self-examined in the way in which it holds on to the belief-style to which it is committed. IA is militantly committed and the two others, both IIB and IB, tend towards an ethos-type approach, or one of maintenance-orientation. However, IIB (the managerial mode) has a kind of flexibility in action derived from the fact that the commitment to the belief-style seems to mean less personally, there is a less strongly felt need to bring it directly into the lives of people who don't have it now, and there seems a greater emphasis on finding ways to make improvements through timely, incremental types of action.

IIA leadership is, of all types most challenging to put into practice. It is most vulnerable to the action of polarized forces. For example, it requires of the leader a greater degree of consciousness, itself a thing hard to come by. It most requires a lively, vital combination in the qualities of the lion and the fox. In the end and in the face of these difficulties there seems to be a ready sliding over of a IIA style into a IIB style of leadership--or, conceivably, back into a charismatic style.

Overall, therefore, one might posit a theory of charismatic intervention; followed by reciprocity, mutual exchange and feedback, and the discovery of "the politics of educational growth" (a creative union of distributive and growth concerns); followed by a gradual over-shadowing of growth by distributive considerations and the politics of incremental change; followed by bureaucratic "normalcy" and/or by increasing rigidity and arbitrariness; followed eventually by a renewed charismatic interruption.

To repeat the above, using the symbols, one would thus have Movement IA, followed by IIA, followed by IIB, followed by IB. In other words Movement II finds itself inserted into the overall motion of Movement I. Instead of two separate arcs on the night sky, there is one, but it is segmented and elongated to accommodate essentially four separable motions. The insertion of Movement II extends the duration (or length) of the arc--it separates by a greater distance of time and space the two polar opposites of charisma and routinized bureaucracy, even though eventually and in the long run the tendency is for things to move in those cycles.

Because Movement II exists we may say that though routinized bureaucracy invites the charismatic intervention, the latter (charisma) may be superceded, not by bureaucracy immediately, but by collegial and even transparent styles of leadership. The question remains open whether, in turn, this more constitutional style could avoid slipping into managerial and thence back into bureaucratic styles. In other words, whether it might happen instead that the constitutional mode would evolve into a constructively anarchic or a non-routinized, transparent, bureaucratic style, or into an admixture of both. In the latter case, it would approximate a democratic style of organization and leadership (cf. the discussion in the previous chapter). This would be Movement III and could be called a continuous transformational style. It might stave off indefinitely any ultimate return to the managerial mode and thence to routinized bureaucracy, followed eventually by rigidification, and arbitrary rule.

However, Movement III is mostly conjecture. What the data does suggest is Movement I and Movement II, and the insertion of the second into the overall arc of the first.

Freeport, most sharply of the four programs studied, exhibits the dynamics of the overall theory. The Pettit Board is a charismatic intervention per excellence. Defiance was and remained strong; emulation was a substantial factor; the move towards the affirmation in practice of a new value was real but remained in a generalized state. Defiance and militancy deepened; the community was polarized; energies went disproportionately into distributive channels; consciousness developed slowly and unevenly; language became stylized into modes of propaganda; and though the way was cleared for change to take place, it was also strewn with wreckage of battle;

and there came forth newly erupted forces of militant-reactive opposition.

Yet, as stated in the previous chapter, a wholly new situation had been created. The old bureaucratic/monarchic administrative pattern had been decisively eliminated. There was room now for new styles and forms, if the new leadership would or could take advantage of the opportunity. Freeport was fortunate that new leaders came who would and who could. The new Superintendent Cartmill and new Elementary Supervisor Keith, and others, sought dialog and reciprocity (even a degree of transparency) with some forces; and they sought a simultaneously stabilizing policy of containment of some other forces, seesawing between styles IIA and IIB (though style IA, the charismatic, was followed by the new principal at the middle school for two years until he was removed).

After two years, and the coming into power on the Board of moderate and militant oppositionists, there seemed to be, or about to take place, a rollback. Most of the new team brought in by the Pettit Board was removed. Even Keith's position, as Elementary Supervisor, the following year was eliminated from under her. However, as explained in the previous chapter, new forces on the Board committed to open education combined with the moderate leadership of the chairman, Bud Fillmore, to make a compromise with the conservatives possible, whereby Keith stayed on as principal of the largest elementary school.

Under the impact of these largely conservative and moderate forces, and because of his own predilection for achievement-centered education and only a tolerance for open-centered education the Superintendent increasingly shifted towards style IIB, playing an effective managerial role. In some respects he shifted even beyond that, towards a bureaucratic style (IB). Inevitably, this in turn, together with the reduction of her own role, eroded Keith's IIA style, causing her to slip from its charismatic overtones at one end, towards its more managerial overtones at the other. Reciprocity remains important in her style; transparency somewhat less so. To some degree, she seems to be moving towards a managerial mode, style IIB, in practice. In her consciousness and as much of her practice as possible she remains loyal to style IIA. The degree to which Keith can act upon it depends to a large degree on the Board.

Two figures on the Board are critical: the chairman, Merton Fillmore, achievement-centered, a moderate, and charismatic in an emulative mode with an element of defiance in his background; and the other top vote-getter Jean O'Brien, open-centered, also a moderate and charismatic, closer both to defiance and to new values than is Fillmore.

The two communicate fairly well with each other. They also successfully interpret to their own supporters the positions of the other. They form a possible base and basis for sustaining and extending a forward motion in Freeport. They could push off farther in the future, that is, a completion of Movement I, the return to routinization. In pursuit of this they would need to deploy a shrewd mix of the elements of charisma, reciprocity, and managerial capability that is available to them (neither is stylized heavily into any single one of those modes). They would need to pursue a strategy not dissimilar from that followed by Marcia Keith in her first two years as Elementary Supervisor. This would mean locating and encouraging innovators among the teachers and concerned parents on the one hand, and on the other maintaining an atmosphere of caring and responsibility throughout the school system. Especially is strategy of this kind needed at the middle school and the high school. If substantial progress does not occur at these levels within the next five years, the fundamental changes and gains that have occurred at the elementary level will tend to wither away.

The overall theory is less sharply visible in the other three projects studied. Yet either the pattern is there, or it provides a way of gauging the flow of change. Collins Brook School began in a charismatic moment of rebellion in which defiance, emulation, and relatively unclarified prophetic elements (new values) mingled unevenly. The prophetic elements grew and became relatively clarified through practice. Patterns of rebellion recurred and were worked out, or eliminated at some cost. Reciprocity and transparency grew as consciousness increased; anti's tended to be worked with and transcended, rather than rejected. Managerial and bureaucratic motifs increased during and after the critical third year. An originally IA charismatic style has evolved towards a mix of IIA and IIB leaning towards the former, though with a continuing flow of charismatic elements. New values have taken root in the institutional fabric of the school. Whether eventually the school will settle into a routine in the free-centered mode is not at this point likely, but always remains a possibility. It will not in so far as consciousness continues to grow and as education as an interactional process among and between adults and children (already practiced to some considerable degree) begins to prevail over the earlier child-centered self-image and rhetoric of the school.

In Brunswick rebellion came from two sources--those charismatically intervening against authoritarian administrative behavior and maintenance-oriented education on the one hand; and those charismatically intervening on behalf of the voiceless and largely tradition-minded "middle Americans," both Franco-Americans and Old Yankees. These two rebellions tended to cancel each other out. Or they were deployed against one another by intervening leadership from the "establishment classes" who were highly emulative of the achievement-centered, upper middle class, suburbanesque dream.

Fending off the attacks from the "middle American" leaders, or co-opting their leaders, the establishment liberals borrowed some of the rhetoric and some of the values of the anti-authoritarians. These values related to less maintenance-oriented classrooms overall; and to more flexible classrooms (code word for both open and achievement-centered education though with mphasis on the latter) at a new elementary school, Jordan

Acres. Their charismatic impetus was low, because it was highly emulative and because of a low tolerance for rebellion (being establishment-oriented with a class position to defend). Their acceptance of anti-authoritarian values extended to the classroom but did not extend to administrative operations. Here command and bureaucratic structuring remained largely intact. Consequently, though reciprocity and transparency were highly touted and apparently meant to be effectuated in the classrooms, and to a degree were given more space to emerge and grow, yet a strong contradiction came into play between what was expected of the teacher (reciprocity) and what was expected of the administrator (managerial efficiency at best, bureaucratic routine and routinization more usually).

The principal at Jordan Acres, a leader of managerial talents (IIB) and of IIA potential, found himself squeezed by the contradiction, and left (or was removed). The Elementary Supervisor, Barbara Kurz, a leader with impressive potential, is also caught or caught up in this squeeze, wanting reciprocity (IIA), but enacting more often managerial, and increasingly, bureaucratic roles and meanings (IB).

The Brunswick school system remains in a "half-way" condition, with feelings and eruptive mutterings of discontent surfacing from time to time, in the classrooms, among the teachers in their Association, among the parents and among the townspeople at large.

Upward Bound at Bowdoin in its first few years began in a rebellious mood of charismatic intervention in which elements of defiance, emulation, and new values were all mixed in substantial proportions. But the movement towards new values remains unfulfilled, except in individual classes and parts of the program from time to time. Emulative values preponderate in students, staff and leadership. Reciprocity at lower levels goes hand in hand with strong protectively charismatic leadership from the top. This leadership in turn has often collided with the principle and practice of reciprocity at lower levels in the organizational hierarchy. Motifs of rebellion remain vital, and this continues to be strongly felt and communicated by the leader. Yet she remains emulative of "masculine" images of charismatic leadership. This impedes a moving forward to a new value, both concerning sexual roles, and concerning the nature of reciprocity itself (that it moves towards a transcending of old dichotomies and a transcending thus also of old emulative desires to replace or imitate what is being rebelled against: a new reciprocity can take place when resentment and admiration of "the perceived master" can be, has been, surmounted). This struggle in her is mirrored in the students and in the program by the ambivalence towards "middle class" values, the rebellion against them, the desire for them. Consequently the program is ambivalent. The ambivalence manifests itself in a rich potpourri of offerings and belief-styles of education.

Yet this does not mean the program is "unsuccessful"--in terms of undoing blocks to self-confidence, in terms of aiding "disadvantaged people" to get on in the world; in terms of exposing professors and other adults to new teaching experiences, in these terms it is and continues to be very successful. And it is an exciting experience. In these terms, and given the contradictions that would need to be surmounted or somehow lived with, the program may have exactly the kind of structure and the kind of leadership required to gain these results. Yet change is limited.

As a result of doing the study, I discovered to myself a notion of my preferred style of leadership, just as also I discovered the differentiated belief-style of education (cf. Chapter Three) as something I considered to be best.

When first taking stock I felt my instincts were clearly with Style IIA, the reciprocal or constitutional mode, with considerable emphasis on transparency, and leaning slightly towards the charismatic side. Yet this style needs special circumstances and conditions: an absence of traumatic polarization is vital and an absence of an entrenched, routinized structure is vital if this style is to find space to emerge and grow.

Therefore, charismatic and managerial styles are also critically important under certain conditions. And though my biases were strongly not in favor of the bureaucratic mode, I have also come to see that, given a measure of transparency in the roles and relationships that are established, a more formally bureaucratic style can be very useful.

What seems for me to emerge basically from this is a need to search in theory and in practice for a better style of leadership for change: a style that accepts the hardness (or inertia) of the material as a given and has a large passion for effectuating new values and new patterns of relationships. It would be a style which is basically charismatic. But it would lean in its rebellion more towards new values than towards emulation. It would strive for consciousness in all its several aspects articulated in Chapter Five. It would evolve a strategy that is structurally oriented and capable, in crises, of self-distance (as discussed in Chapter Seven). Since therefore it would be highly feedback oriented, and even managerial in character, it could compensate for the deficiencies of charismatic leadership per se (tendencies toward over-romanticism and chauvinism and so forth).

This style might be called "structural leadership." It is a "high standard," as is the differentiated belief-style of educational growth, articulated in Chapter Three. Yet it does not seem impracticable; I have registered "intimations of it" in my research. Most importantly, it offers a theoretical guide, both for research in leadership, and for the practice of leadership, that can help the human species improve on its quest for a better modus vivendi of "getting there from here."

PART III

CONCLUSIONS

CONCLUSIONS

I divide the conclusions drawn from this study into specific findings and general theses.

Specific Findings:

Confirmation of the Four Original Hypotheses

The study began with four hypotheses concerning the how of change. They underwent a degree of development and modification in the early stages of the research. How that took place is detailed in Part I of this monograph. Critical to this process was a gradual sorting out of the relationship between educational activity and political activity. Each of these activities reveals a dialectic relationship between distributive concerns and growth concerns. The demarcation as well as the interrelationship between distributiveness and growth is analyzed in the last chapter of Part I. There it is argued that distributive action allocates existing values (material and non-material); is indirect or calculative; deals with classes of things; and is a "for the sake of" (doing this in order for that to happen). Growth action by contrast is generative of more values than existed before; is direct and spontaneous; is personal whether in individual or group terms; and desires itself (finds in itself its own raison d'être).

The proposition is presented that when a distributive concern (or "telos," end) overrides concern for growth, that this is political activity; when the reverse is true, and growth overrides distributive considerations, there educational activity prevails.

Educational activity combines in varying configurations both distributive and growth concerns, though for such activity to continue to be meaningfully educational, growth needs to be central to the intention and consciousness of the people involved.

Given the distinction between political and educational activity, the four hypotheses are as follows:

1. There is a class of actions that tends towards a distributive result and a class of actions that tends towards a growth result. In addition there is a class of actions in which the two elements are closely interwoven, often to such a degree that it is difficult to gauge in which direction the action, or actions, are moving, whether towards a distributive or a growth result.

   Leadership in education, especially in change programs, is subject to powerful, often severe, distributive pressures. Such pressures come both from outside and from within the program. The tendency and the temptation is to so engage these pressures in a distributive mode (fight fire with fire) that growth concerns and actions for growth may be overborne or swallowed up.

   Typical manisfestations are:

(1) a vigorous charismatic type of leadership that attempts to swoop everything before it in a general lion-like assault on the system, and/or in a heroic drive to lead a program through the fire of internal and external conflict. The Pettit Board's actions in Freeport tended to be in the charismatic mode; as did those of Dick Watson in the third year of Collins Brook School, though to a lesser degree; and, also to a lesser degree, those of Doris Vladimiroff at Bowdoin's Upward Bound.

(2) A pragmatic, often manipulative, type of leadership that attempts to sidestep the pressures, or contain them, or work with them in order to smooth their rougher edges. Brunswick educational administrators have tended to employ this type of leadership; as has Robert Cartmill as Freeport's superintendent.

Both types of leadership, by fighting fire with fire, court the loss of a growth dynamic. The dilemma is that the pressures are real. It is not possible for leadership, however "idealistic," to wish those pressures away, or to insist that they shouldn't exist. Since they do exist the necessary response is some form of distributive action. The question becomes, not "will or should we engage in distributive action or not?" but "can it be interwoven with actions for growth in such a way that the possibility of growth is sustained, and even expand-ed upon?"

Perspectives on this question, but not definitive answers to them, are provided by the three remaining hypotheses and the general theses below.

2. The second hypothesis held that action contains a feedback factor. Feedback makes striving for change a nonlinear process in which there is a dialectical exchange among and within the consciousness of persons-in-action. This exchange occurs between what a person aims for and what he or she learns, or monitors (that is, discovers and experiences), in the stress and pull of doing it. Between the person-in-action seeking to realize his or her goals and the conditions under which he or she is seeking to realize them there occurs "new matter." This "new matter" is generated in the course of action itself. It may appear from one angle (to the actor) as new or modified goals. Or it may appear as the need for new and better means and to such a degree that the original goals slip back from their original centrality, or seem to be in need of substantial revision. Or thirdly, it may appear to him or her as new, unanticipated, conditions. Or finally, it may appear simultaneously as a change in goals, means, and conditions. He or she must take this "new matter" into account--whether they "want to" or not. Ignoring it, or trying to efface it, itself takes time and energy and this acts subtly upon the

course of action, altering it from what it might otherwise have been. On the other hand, embracing it and merely veering with it, without integrating it, results in a fortuitous change of direction and an abandonment of the original goals.

In action there is thus potential for expansion of aims beyond what was originally conceived--as there is potential for the contraction of those aims contrary to original expectations. New things--aims, values, intentions--are tried in the fire of action. One learns ... by doing. One learns through the process of doing what cannot in all likelihood be learned in any other way. This holds true for personal growth as well as for engagement with a distributive process leading to the material implementation of a program.

New matter may come in the form of a sudden awareness of the work relations among people in the program, or a special insight into their group dynamics. Or it may come in the form of a clearer perception of one's original aims as these aims become actualized, as they shape themselves into life-forms (one sees their limitations and their further possibilities). Or it may come in the form of unexpected responses from unexpected persons in the program (positive or negative) that generate new possibilities or new obstacles. Or it may come in the form of discovering new sources of strength or new evidence of weakness in one's style and character structure. You as actor for change find yourself doing and saying things in action that overtake you with surprise--you didn't know you had that in you. Or it may come in the form of a group of people in a given situation "taking off" and being carried along beyond that situation to new ground. Or the converse of this can happen and consequently there may be a "motion backwards" towards confusion and apathy. Or it may take the form of a clearer perception of power and authority relations previously hidden from view, or unknown, or underdeveloped, but which are revealed in the process of action. Or it may come in the form of people discovering their real expectations--these "come out" in the course of engaging in the actualities of a program and may not be the ones people told themselves they had at the start. Or, a related phenomenon, it may take the form of a progressive unfolding of contradictions in a situation that were only implicit, or even completely unseen and unfelt, at the initiation of a course of action.

Action is a reality test. It sorts out the important from the unimportant for the people engaged in the action. Action thus is always serious. It is rooted in real desire. To engage upon an action costs a person something. It may be some money. Or it may be a piece of yourself, or of someone close to you. What it may cost often looms larger than what it does eventually actually cost--but that is not known in advance. Persons engage in action because there is stuff in them that drives them to it. The motivational ground is more or less open to the actors and/or the observers. But it is also more or less opaque. A movement towards change occurs when persons commit themselves to acting within and upon a situation knowing that it is going to cost and knowing also that it is something they must do.

Action is an experience. It is not the application of an aim abstractly or ideally held in the mind to a set of conditions--as in rationalistic models of the change process. Feedback thus is a word that seems successfully to convey the dimension in action that causes it to be a transactional and modifying experience, and not a set of motions sequentially charted and applied. Action is different from having a plan and putting that into operation by a series of implementing activities. Action is a continuous planning and feedback and re-planning as you go.

Nor is action, on the other hand, a mindless flow of events and situations that is sometimes baptized by the phrase "muddling through." Action is not "pragmatic" in that sense, though some anti-rationalistic models that claim to derive their philosophic validity from Edmund Burke or William James or even G. F. Hegel speak as if the "man of action" is non-intellectual and is guided only by horse sense or common sense or by his own heroic impulses.

Feedback of new matter is real and reflection on this new matter is also real--however intuitively or unscientifically the process of reflection by the person in action tends to be conducted at this stage of human development--or however much attended it is by psychic blocking in the actor in order to make an "irrational," ambiguous process seem rational and safe.

The person in action is not unlike a transformer or mediator. He or she mediates between intention and conditions; they work with and upon the new matter that is generated out of the historical exchange between the two. They thereafter pursue a course which is subtly, or markedly, different from what it had been before. The "new" course indicates the degree to which, and the manner in which, the matter was absorbed and mediated. The result may be a greater expansion of the possibilities that are potential in the situation. Or the result may be a more stable balance. Or the result may be a contraction of possibilities.

The argument of this hypothesis is not that it will be one or the other of these three modes. The argument is a more limited one, namely that imbedded in the stuff of action itself, because of the feedback factor, there is a dimension that cannot be planned for strictly speaking and which cannot be avoided. There is however implied in this hypothesis that a greater consciousness of the nature of the feedback factor gives the person in action an opportunity to develop a style of action that avoids either clobbering a situation or merely succumbing to it. It is a style that in the face of new matter relaxes into the experience of dealing with it much as in the yoga way of exercising one stretches into a new position, one holds it, sustains it, including the normal pain of the encounter, relaxes into it and discovers the sources for an even further stretch to a new position. This is an almost perfect feedback model and may be applied directly to the development of consciousness concerning the processes of human social action for change.

I am satisfied that my research reveals the presence of the feedback factor in action. I am not satisfied that I found data gathering instruments of sufficient sensitivity to gauge, measure and categorize this factor in all its multifarious manifestations.

For this, one would need to go well beyond what I attempted to do. It is, however, a matter of importance for the feedback factor in human action to be recalled from the realms of intuition, romantic mystification, and "gut heroics," and become a subject of careful and sustained investigation. I think I have established the need for this and the direction in which the investigation can go.

3. The third hypothesis concerns the nature of compromise. The reader is invited to turn back to the sixth chapter of Part Two entitled "The Dual Face of Compromise." The argument is made that compromise in one set of actions is so oriented towards distributive concerns that the goals (and the growth concerns that these goals encapsulate) are "forgotten," or allowed to lapse, or are deferred "for the time being;" and the argument is further made that in another set of actions compromise, though it is engaged in because of distributive imperatives, serves the attainment of goals or even, because of the feedback factor, the expansion of goals in practice. Since goals encapsulate a concern for growth, and growth is dynamic, the working out of goals in practice is dialectic. Modifications, adaptations, inventions of prudence, "creative leaps," the zig-zags of practice are thus in their form compromises, yet they serve to propel forward the program in the given

historical situation (or, more modestly, prevent it from slipping back).

Compromise is essentially a distributive response to perceived opportunities and obstacles in a situation. Compromise that ends in abandonment of goals may in large measure be the function of a faulty response to the feedback factor just as compromise that ends in a sustaining or creative modification of goals in practice may be a function of an integrative response to feedback.

If the person in action over a period of time, or in a situation of considerable stress (a crisis event), evinces a disposition to meet problems in a distributive manner and if he or she speaks habitually from a vocabulary that stresses a need to be "pragmatic" or "tough minded" (or"single minded in pursuit of the commitment"), it is likely that one is seeing leadership whose end is abandonment of goals and a blunting of growth possibilities--however instrumentally justifiable such leadership may be in a given situation. On the other hand, if the person in action (also over a period of time or in a crisis situation) evinces a disposition to meet problems in a manner that is distributive from one angle but reveals a sense of real or direct relationship between the need for "an adjustment" and the protection or enhancement of a growth possibility which this adjustment may serve and if the vocabulary bears witness to the need to protect or enhance the growth possibilities of human beings, it is likely that one is seeing leadership whose end is the uniting of the distributive and growth dimensions of action "in that actual historical situation."

An important finding for me was the shock of discovering that both the charismatic (lion-like) hero and the more durable, pragmatic or flexible fox (who is so often presented as a polar opposite) evince behavior in action whose end is the abandonment of goals and the dominance of distributive over growth concerns. The argument I make is not that these types of leadership shouldn't exist. They do exist, not only, but under particular historical circumstances it is hard to imagine how they could not but appear as inevitable instrumentalities called forth by the hardness or treacherousness of the circumstances.

However, once it is well understood how these seeming opposites resemble each other in the decisive respect of the abrogation of goals that encapsulate a growth possibility, we will no longer divide the world of conceptual possibilities of leadership between them. We will look at action, and at leadership in action, that evinces the attempt at integrative compromise--of a kind that interacts, at whatever levels of consciousness, with the feedback factor. We will then also discover, I surmise, that [illegible] behavior which previously we had mistakenly identified as charismatic or pragmatic, doesn't really belong in those categories.

We need to widen the scope of analysis and develop more precise categories to reflect back conceptually the rich variety of behaviors of people in action and of styles of human leadership. Chapters 8 and 9 of Part Two attempt this. I make a further summary comment in general findings below.

4. The fourth hypothesis posited a basic, systemic, ambiguity in the position occupied by the leader of the change program. To a degree this ambiguity touches all members of the program who are deeply involved, but the pressures that create the ambiguity tend to be heaviest on the role of leader. That role, on the one hand, requires a steady sensitivity to distributive needs of the program vis-à-vis its social environment (including the sheer survival of the program); and vis-à-vis the internal relations of the program itself (including the leader's own power relations with other members of the program). On the other hand, that role requires a steady sensitivity to the growth imperatives contained in the change-imbued goals of the program and in the assumptions of the activity (especially true of education) that is

being carried on.

There is not necessarily an incompatibility between these two kinds of pressures but the relationship tends to be one of tension, often severe tension. It stems from a contradiction inherent in the situation produced by the attempt to introduce a change in the structure of forces in the social environment (see immediately below for a summary discussion of the structural nature of change). Once a project is launched there is an almost immediate need to protect and even expand space (political, psychic, and often material space) for the program from hostile and/or confused forces impinging on the program from without *and* from the internal divergencies, disputes, differences of viewpoint, and ego hostilities that build up and threaten to collapse the program from within. These pressures require a distributive response from the leader in order to assure the continuity and even the survival of the program. And, since the leader's own ego and estimates of his own survival in the role are also at stake, the tendency is reinforced for the leader to act and reflect on his action in a strongly distributive mode. There is a powerful impetus therefore for the leader, and the program, to get skewed into a preoccupation with the distributive motif with commensurate loss of the growth motif and a consequent blunting of the impetus for sustained transformation.

To the other side, however, there may be, and often is, present in the situation forces strongly committed to growth concerns. The goals tend to be couched in vivid transformational language. The consciousness of individuals, including the leader, is touched, if not charged, with an experiential sense of the importance of these goals. The entire raison d'être of the program is rooted in the expectation, if not the assumption, that it exists in order to bring about a change in accord with the newly found human aspirations contained, embodied, in the goals. Since growth imperatives are also present in the structure of forces enveloping a change program and its leader(s), and since the latter themselves, however shallowly or deeply, see themselves as sharing these imperatives--therefore the growth motif also acts as a strong and compelling force upon the leader. Indeed it may happen that the pressures emanating from the concern for growth may be so compelling, so one-sidedly growth oriented and correspondingly lacking in a correlative distributive consciousness, that the leader is betrayed into action that ignores the harder distributive realities and so diminishes the real space that the program occupies.

These are counter forces, or contradictory poles, inherent in the structure of the situation. They are often acted out as a difficult and often painful struggle, within the psyche and consciousness of the leader. Much therefore does depend on the degree to which the leader can increase his or her consciousness of the nature of these contradictory forces; of the fact that they are structurally inherent in the situation; of the fact that both are critically needed; and of the need therefore to find ways effectively to mediate between the two tendencies (which are also needs)--not in the sense of playing off one against the other, for that repeats the distributive mistake, but rather in the sense of relating them so that each supports the other in real situations. Once again one recognizes the need for a wider and a more sensitively sophisticated analysis of action-behavior and of leadership styles than is contained in the mainstream of social science research.

General Theses

1. Social change is structural in nature.

Structure as a concept used in this study is a dynamic embodiment of three factors that are often kept separate in social analysis. They are: pattern of organization; process of interchange among people in their various roles; and the often conflicting purposes or meanings people have about their roles and about the activity these roles are supposed to accomplish (be it educational activity, or family activity, or economically productive activity, or political activity, or religious activity).

Structure is a concept that unites objective "facts" and subjective "values;" it unites the outer world of conditions and the inner world of consciousness; it unites the flow of life and the channels in which the flow occurs. Structure is dialectics in action. Structure is the expression of wholes in being and of the internal relations of those wholes.

Presumably, the human species is a whole, and as a whole constitutes a structure (especially as the human species might be viewed from Mars by a non-earthling, sentient being). Yet for the human species as a whole none of the three factors of pattern, process, or purposes is very clearly articulated or integrated at this stage in human history.

Short of the human species as a whole, there is an immense range of human (sub) structures, according to kind (family, school, economy, polity and so forth) and according to level and breadth of territorial generality (local, regional, national, multi-national). Each structure is relatively--that is, more or less--differentiated within itself; each one is relatively autonomous vis-à-vis other structures above it or below it or side by side with it; and each structure is relatively and reciprocally implicated in the workings of these other structures.

This study has dealt with structures that embody educational activity at the local level.

Change happens when all three factors of pattern, process, and purpose are modified. Such integral modification constitutes a transformation in the structure. Sometimes a gentle shift in a protean and experimental structure can produce an integral modification. Sometimes a strong reform in a steadily functioning structure can produce a similar result. On the other hand, in a well established and fairly congealed structure, there may be needed a revolutionary set of actions to inaugurate such a transformation.

Change for that reason does not lie in the intensity of the upheaval nor in the slow subtlety of adroit incremental adjustments. Either or neither of these might work in a given situation. Change lies, instead, in the degree to which, whether by means of the lion's roar or the smooth elocution of the fox (or both), a modification occurs that materially effects--all together and integrally-- the three factors of pattern, process, and purposes.

Change as it acts upon a structure, carries with it the strong implication that it will affect not only values if that's where it starts, but also roles; not only roles, but also established power configurations. Or, in another situation, change affects not only established power relations, if that's where it starts, but also values; and not only values but also roles; and so on. Thus change has a high potential for reverberatory consequences throughout a structure. It may appear threatening to many different points within that structure. Change tends therefore to encounter much resistance, some of it boisterous, much more of it of the silent type. A characteristic reflex action on the part of an ongoing structure is to absorb change, to tame it, to domesticate it, and turn it into more appearance than substance. This may indeed be a social "law"--the law of the containment of change.

Instead of asking, "why is it that the more things change the more they stay the same?" one might more appropriately ask, "how is it that change actually does from time to time take place?" Posing the question this way would lead us to concentrate much more attention on change as a problem of structural modification. We would also focus more carefully on such aspects in the change process as consciousness and strategy--consciousness because we would need to see the interrelationship-in-life of values, roles and pattern of authority; and strategy because we would need to develop a style of action, and a set of actions for given situations, that genuinely dealt with the concrete interrelationship-in-life of values, roles and pattern of authority.

Social change hitherto has too much been the preserve of the demagogue and/or of the expert planner. When we have once come to a deep consciousness that change is the modification of living structures we will realize that both the romantic demogogue and the rational planner belong to a time that is hopefully passing away--a time of inadequate, even false, consciousness; a time of strategic naiveté.

2. Change occurs as the coming into being, structurally, of a new value.

Change means that a new way is being found, in practice, of understanding the purpose of the activity; a new way is being found of relating people in their roles and thus also changing the roles; and a new way is being found of patterning the exercise and flow of authority. Changes which do not reach these levels of modification are not changes but recycling or recapitulation of the existing structure.

The central mechanism which triggers the process of change is the dialectic of rebellion. Rebellion has three elements within it varying in initial strength vis-à-vis one another in the consciousness of the rebel. They are: first, defiance against the authoritative symbols of the prevailing structure; second, an emulation of some or all of the features of that which is being rebelled against; and third, a prophetic insight into a new value. The last named seeks to transcend the dichotomy of rebel versus the established structure in the direction of a new structure. It is a will to go beyond defiance and emulation towards the discovery-in-life of new patterns, processes and purposes transcending the old but yet also (because it is a transcendence and not a dichotomous rejection) incorporating elements of past configurations and meanings.

Thus, true change is a complete movement through successive stages of defiance, emulation and the articulation in life of a new value. Change as defiance, simply, is pseudo-change. Defiance as such expends itself in effervescence, in protests and negative posturing, in the letting out of anger through destructive acts, including self-destructive acts. Yet defiance is a necessary ingredient, a sine qua non, for successful change.

On the other hand, it is possible to think of change also as a general movement from defiance to emulation and stopping there. In this case those in rebellion, or a representative portion of them, win a better place in the prevailing structure. By this infusion there may also be a heightening in the vigor and overall performance of the structure. Competence levels may rise and there may be a greater flexibility in the way roles are differentiated so that people relate more immediately and effectively. Power relations may even be loosened up for a time and authority less immersed in the externals of standard operating procedures. The entire structure may experience for a time a shaking up out of its older lethargy and/or ingrained defense of established privilege and power. There may be a spirit of self-examination flowing through the structure that is a welcome change from its customary preoccupation with self-maintenance (cf. Chapter 4 Part II for a discussion of the different ways of holding on to a belief-style).

Yet in spite of these shifts in mood, in role relationship, and in the identity of who gets rewarded, the change is not profound, and it may not last. Established forces of power and privilege remain imbedded in the structure. Old definitions of how authority is exercised remain unaffected. The consciousness of people about the nature and purpose of the activity embodied in the structure is not basically modified.

If defiance, simply, is pseudo-change, then defiance plus emulation leads no further than half-way change. Or we might call it change in a minor key to distinguish it from true change. From one angle it seems like some change has taken place; from another it seems like no change at all.

3. Leadership in Situations of Change Tends to Follow a Path which may be Charted in Two Interconnected Movements. The first movement begins in a charismatic intervention and ends in a routinization of the original charisma. As such this is a restatement of the familiar Weberian thesis. However, that thesis, as such, forecloses other possibilities--

---

Max Weber, Essays in Sociology, translated, edited, with an introduction by H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills, Oxford University Press, 1958.

save for the--to Weber--archaically interesting traditional type of leadership which he also identified. The Weberian thesis is rooted in the assumption that (modern) leadership is "nothing but" an immersion in either lion-like or fox-like behavior and activity (either an "all or nothing" type of action or supple and indirect action). This has the effect of reducing leadership to a distributive movement merely, understood in two modes, one being total commitment to the kingdom of ends and the eventual and consequent justification of means by the ends; and the other one being a similarly "total commitment" (or "total abandonment") to the kingdom of means in which questions of ends are swallowed up in the preoccupation with means.

This overly distributive bias in the understanding of leadership depreciates the impingement of growth concerns on leadership. It tends to be blind to the facts, which often show an organic mating of distributive and growth concerns in the same action or series of actions--both by leaders and followers.

I sought to take these latter facts into account in a more complete theory while at the same time preserving the Weberian perception that people and events do reveal in given situations the intervention of the charismatic hero followed by a subsequent routinization of that charisma. I therefore posited a second movement in which growth concerns seem to be substantial. The motion begins with a strong emphasis on reciprocity, or mutual interaction and feedback. Here growth concerns are in a state of dynamic balance with distributive constraints. To one side (i.e., leaning towards the beginning of the motion) the balance is more in favor of growth. There is a degree of consciousness--and of action issuing forth from that consciousness--concerning the interaction of growth and distributive imperatives in real situations. The resolution of the contradiction between the two sets of imperatives is in favor of growth. To the other side (i.e., leaning towards the ending of the motion), though there is some consciousness of interaction, the resolution of the contradiction tends to be in favor of distributive considerations. I denominate these two phases of the movement, respectively, the constitutional and the managerial.

I posit a link between these two overall movements by fitting the second in between the two terms of the first movement. So that we chart the progression (or morphology) of change as follows:

IA--Charismatic intervention.

IIA--Emergence of growth-oriented leadership which integrates growth and distributive concerns in a "nice" balance; such leadership needs to be partly charismatic to one side and partly managerial to the other; in a word, the constitutional leader.

IIB--Emergence of managerial leadership which tries to balance growth and distributive forces as if they were "equal;" to one side such leadership seems growth-oriented but to the other side--and increasingly over time--it becomes more and more bureaucratic.

IB--The emergence of leadership with a routinizing, control-conscious style, often called pejoratively, the bureaucratic.

The second movement (IIA and IIB), therefore, if it takes hold, can expand the interval between the charismatic intervention (IA) and the onset of routinization (IB). It can deepen and extend the growth-experience during that interval.

A further implication of this overall scheme is that once the routinization phase is reached, and once it ossifies into a stagnant condition, as it tends to do, or degenerates into arbitrary administration, there comes into being a situation that is once again rife for a charismatic intervention--in which case the cycle in one form or another will be repeated.

There are observable factors that seem strongly to affect whether or not the second movement will take hold or not.

The first is the degree of structural ossification and stagnation that has taken place in the routinization phase. If intense, the rebellion against it is also likely to be intense. The explosion, when it comes, is likely to be deeply charismatic and the counter-opposition is also likely to be deeply reactive. The forces in the social field are likely to be polarized and antagonistic. Distributive concerns become paramount. The soil is relatively barren for the successful intervention and application of growth leadership. The consciousness of the charismatic leadership is overly conditioned by "true believership." It is caught up in defiance and (covert) emulation. It is insufficiently oriented towards rebellion as the transformation of structures and the progressive embodiment of new values.

So that a second, dialectically related factor, in addition to the degree of structural stagnation, is the degree to which one or the other of three elements in rebellion become paramount in the behavior and consciousness of the actors for change. If the pain of oppression, dialectically evoked (caused) by the arbitrariness and stagnation of the social field, cuts very deeply into the consciousness of the oppressed without there being a correlative integrative and absorptive capacity in the rebel, the resulting rebellion reaches only as far as defiance, and tends to preclude a motion towards the generation of a new value that transcends the situation of domination-and-reaction-to-domination in the direction of a new structure.

The defiance may become merely destructive, of self and of society, and come to an end, exhausted of its energy, purged and empty. But--finding a lowering of resistance and continuing long enough, defiance is deflected and re-channeled. It becomes domesticated and reaches no farther than emulation. The secret longing to be like the oppressor, or like what was admired in the oppressor (be it mastery, or wielding of authority, or control of the system), or to have what the oppressor is envied for having (power, material goods, upper-class manners, status)--this secret longing, which was masked or overborne in the earlier phases of defiance, now "comes out," and if it is allowed scope there results the gradual assimilation of the oppressed (or at any rate a certain number of the oppressed) into the prevailing system.

What has just been described is a first possibility in the dialectics of rebellion, one in which the element of defiance is paramount. A second possibility occurs when the social field is oppressive, cuts sharply and harshly into the consciousness of the rebel, but the rebel is or becomes possessed of absorptive capacity to integrate the pain. He or she grows through the experience, and grows towards a perception of the structural nature of the relations of domination. Though defiant, the rebel discovers the impulse to a new value and envisions the potential for the transcendance of existing relations of domination in the direction of new structures. This is a promising field for the intervention of a charismatic leadership, which though vital enough, abrupt enough, and harsh enough if need be, to breach the bristling but brittle walk of the entrenched system, nevertheless may also lead on to the emergence of a more constitutional leadership in which the ground is laid for new beginnings (new structures). This may occur either by a tempering of the charisma, and its high levels of defiance, or by a transfer of leadership from persons with a charismatically oriented character structure to persons with a constitutionally oriented character structure.

A third possibility in the dialectics of rebellion occurs when the actors for change in an oppressive social field do not feel its oppressiveness with compelling or overriding force. The existing system may be relatively successful in "delivering the goods." Therefore, what might otherwise be experienced as intense deprivation may now be seen (and treated) only as relative maladjustment to an otherwise seemingly reasonable material order. This has been a basic argument in the writings of Herbert Marcuse.

Herbert Marcuse, One Dimensional Man: Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society (Boston: Beacon Press, 1964); and Essay on Liberation (Boston: Beacon Press, 1969).

The data in my study, especially from Brunswick, tend to support the argument. Rebellion is not deeply felt. Defiance in the agents for change is low, though it is not insubstantial. Emulation, therefore, tends to be the paramount element in rebellion from the beginning. Better assimilation, better adjustment to the existing system, becomes a basic objective.

A fourth possibility occurs when the social field is not oppressive but it nevertheless reveals deficiencies and, in any case, may be perceived as not as good as it might be. Defiance, therefore, is again fairly low keyed. Neither is there impetus towards a new value--one that replaces existing relations by others. The paramount impetus is emulation, the desire to excel in the same direction in which things are already going. One might call this the emulation of excellence. It is the desire to expand, to improve, and expand again--developing a motion that goes from what is already perceived as good enough to something even better.

So far two factors have been identified as bearing on whether or not the second movement (IIA and IIB) will take hold or not in the morphology of change. They are the degree of ossification in the social field, and the degree to which one or other of three elements gains paramountcy in the dialectics of rebellion.

A third factor was touched upon above in the discussion of the second of four possibilities that inhere in the dialectics of rebellion. It concerns the degree to which charismatic leadership can succeed in shifting from a charismatic to a constitutional mode--either by its own self-transformation or by transferring power to others with a constitutional character-structure. Of central importance here is the degree to which the feedback factor (cf. discussion of the second hypothesis above) is blended in, or incorporated, or becomes an integral part of the leadership style. Unless such blending in or integration occurs, the charisma will remain at most one or two dimensional. The wish for a more tempered and flexible style of leadership may be present in the charismatic leader; the vision of a structure that embodies new relations may be strong in his or her political imagination; but the ability to act on this may be lacking because there is insufficient sensitivity to, or insufficient consciousness of, or insufficient experience in, dealing with the feedback factor. The tendency is to rely on what has worked, to lean too heavily on familiar distributive patterns, and to foreclose on the possibilities of growth through practice. An awareness of feedback, and a will to move with it, would open up these possibilities. However, it is necessary to register the caveat that the reactive forces (or, that is, reactionaries) in the social field--thrown up by the defiance of the charismatic intervention--may continue to be so intractable that a feedback-oriented posture which includes a high degree of "listening" to others, may prove abortive, and in any event very risky. In that event one probably must continue in the charismatic mode, but at the profound risk of never reaching a constitutional, growth inspiring, mode of leadership. That is, one invites the routinization of charisma.

To offset these somber observations, one should look again at the feedback factor. In addition to a heightened quality of listening, it also engenders a clearer perception, to the agent for change, of the real relations in the social field. Feedback-in-practice yields true social knowledge of friends, confused people, temporizers, and enemies--including knowledge of these types, or qualities, in oneself. More true, that is, than any other kind of knowledge. Thus the feedback factor can lead on to a strategy that effectively isolates enemies and identifies friends, confused people, and temporizers. The strategy will be one in which some contradictions will be seen as needing strong distributive action and others as needing mediation, consciousness raising and patient efforts to transcend old dichotomies. Such a strategy is a fourth important factor in the transition from charisma to constitutionality, from an abrupt intervention into an oppressive structure to the generation and embodiment of new values.

4. Leadership for educational change is both more and less political than leadership for change in the governmental sphere.

It is less political in this sense: the immediate aim of the activity, being educational, is to generate growth in whatever mode it is believed that it can best be attained. (This study has differentiated six such modes; cf. Ch. 3, Part Two.) In addition, the role of educational leader, whether teacher or administrator or board member, inevitably confronts the occupant with the challenge of growing versus not growing. It is harder for educational leaders not to be affected by the prevailing emphasis on growth, than it is for politicians and government administrators for whom distributive concerns are the order of day. This may partly explain why defenses against growth, among school leaders who find themselves immersed inextricably in distributive imperatives, are often so elaborate, so subtle, so incorrigible. The daily challenge, often personal confrontation with the demands of growth, borne in the face of a steady habit of administrative finesse which seeks to handle all things distributively, may produce a towering need to build just such defenses.

The politics of governmental activity, on the other hand, is more caught up in frankly distributive concerns. Such activity touches growth in the indirect sense of sustaining and at times intervening in the conditions that in turn help or hinder other areas of human economic and cultural activity to accomplish their objectives. At a less immediately visible level, governmental activity does touch on growth more directly. Public life--no matter how much that life may be attenuated or distorted in given regimes--exhibits concern for common interests and purposes that go beyond the adding up (or subtracting) of the sum of particular or private interests that are present in a commonwealth. Thus public life is understood as activity--for the citizen as well as for the office holder--in which the question of the fulfillment of human meaning is directly involved. For example, the exercise of action-for-choice, or, as it may be called, the self-actualization of human freedom, can occur in and through public life.

Hitherto in the history of the human species, this dimension of public life has not had a very compelling presence; it has been overborne by the realities and shadows of forces and counterforces needing distributive, often narrowly distributive, solutions. There lacked the time or will or opportunity for the expansion of human freedom in the form of self-actualization. The future may hold this in store for the human species. When this occurs the separation between the world of government and citizen activity on the one hand and the world of education on the other will be less severe. Even so, the kind of passion, and the kind of growth, exhibited in and through human action in things of the public, will remain closer to the distributive model *per se* than to the growth model *per se*. The possibilities for the common-growth, the growth of a collectivity as collectivity, will with difficulty approach the possibilities inherent in personal growth. The two are related but also quite distinct.

Nor, by way of afterthought, is it an argument that the exceptional man who gains public office, let us say in a well-ordered public, may achieve the possibilities of growth that elude the public, understood as the collection of "average men." Let the office of the exceptional man be given whatsoever extraordinary powers, so that he is like a monarch among men, nevertheless the imperatives inherent in his role as protector, mediator, judge, lawgiver, guide and hangman, of and for the people, condemn him to the activity of distributive politics and leave him little room for the growth that consists in self-actualization, the cultivation of his body and his soul.

Having made the argument that educational leadership is less political, it is equally necessary to argue that in another sense it is more political than leadership in the governmental sphere. It is more political in the sense that growth, in and out of the classroom, in and out of administrative offices, in and out of school committee sessions, can only take place if there is a fairly high degree of "natural" and/or consciousness-induced sensitivity to the distributive dimension in all human activity. This means a sensitivity to the intimate way in which distributive questions, processes, and demands do necessarily impinge on growth possibilities--and vice versa. This high degree of sensitivity is itself a political perception.

The effective educational leader, therefore, has to develop a political sensitivity concerning what does and does not work distributively in the process of helping people grow. A leader encounters every day the richness, diversity, complexity, contrariety--and contrariness--of people who, whatever else they may be doing and however they may understand what they are doing, are trying to grow. Distributive choices by leaders can help or hinder this.

In addition, part of growing, for people in the schools--especially kids--is "growing up" about authority; that is, finding a way that helps them integrate their sense of themselves in relation to distributive rules, judgments, and commands. Therefore, educational leadership every day models a certain type of integration of authority patterns--for better or for worse.

Thus, in both an external sense (roles and relationships) and in an internal sense (conveyed meanings of authority) educational leadership is profoundly political.

5. The growth of children in school depends on the growth of the adults involved in the educational process--and vice versa.

The study encountered considerable mystification on this point. There seemed a widespread tendency (common to very different programs) to think of education, or at least to talk about education, as if it meant solely the growth of the child. Aims were couched in that language, and it seemed as if the adults saw themselves as people who were "spozed" to talk and think as if only the child mattered. The few demurrals came from "dyed-in-the-wool" traditionalists, who asserted the claim of the parents as being basic; from women teachers who were absorbing themes from women's liberation arguments and were therefore beginning to ask whether the classroom and the school should not be thought of as a substantive experience for them over and above their stereotyped role as serving the needs of the kids; and from those few who were taking a differentiated approach to education and saw the practical implications of this approach for all adults in their various roles in the educational process.

But these demurrals aside, the prevailing emphasis of the educators (whether they were achievement-oriented or believers in the open concept or in the free concept of education) was on "what can/must we do for the children." Consequently the question of the needs of teachers and administrators, board members, parents (their need to grow, too) was not thought of, or was added in as an afterthought.

Short courses, in-service training programs, and seminars for adults in education are encouraged and often strongly pushed. But usually the reference is to enabling "the trainee" to do for the child better. There is such a heavy dose of "benevolence" and "philanthropy" in this posture that one is almost inclined to accuse the school system of "bad faith." Because, inevitably and in real-life terms, education is an interactive process, in which all of the participants necessarily have a personal stake. This is true not only in ego-terms (though ego-triggered behavior is what frequently "comes out" because of the thwarting of the whole person) but in terms of growth and self-actualization of the adult person in the job. When the growth potentialities-in-the-job of the adults in education are not brought out consciously, are not fully and freely acknowledged, are not felt, cared for and stimulated in direct ways, but are at the most only subsumed under the rhetoric of "doing the very best we can for each and every child," of "getting the maximum return of every dollar for the benefit of the kids"--in the face of these failures and under the gun of these and similar sentimentalities, education becomes a mystifying process. In such a process, children are serviced by trained people. Or they are smothered by teachers who are giving unstintingly large amounts of unexamined surrogate "mother" love. Or both. But children do not encounter the growth-expanding experience of interacting with adults who are trying to grow in their roles and as persons.

A more useful and accurate focus for adult improvement programs in education would be programs in which primary attention is given to raising consciousness about the structures and processes of interactions that occur (or may occur) in systems and sub-systems of educational activity; programs that aim to enhance consciousness that the growth of the child is understood to occur in a context of growth for all who are involved. One can state this even more radically: that the aim of education is the growth of everyone involved, not the child first of all, or the teacher first of all, or the administrator or the parent--but of everyone involved. This, though it seems on the face of it less realistic, is probably more in keeping with the facts.

Where children don't or can't grow, neither can the adults who are involved. And _vice versa_. Where teachers and other involved adults are growing, so are the children. And _vice versa_. If these are the facts, and we make the appropriate inferences, we may be on the verge of a new way of looking at education.

In the programs studied the practice was often better (less mystifying) than the rhetoric. Even so, and even in the better programs, the mystification tended to slow down the process of growth.

6. _School administration is overwhelmingly important to the success and failure of schools_.

This is not as such an argument for crash programs to bring a "new word" to administrators--for the very good reason that school administrators are, to a greater or less degree it is true, but nevertheless to some considerable degree are severely conditioned by the social environment within which they have to exist. The pressures are multiferious and heavy, coming from within and without the school system. The social system is either so balkanized and in a state of polarization and conflict, or it is so dominated by status quo ideology, that school administrations are relatively helpless in preserving, much less creating, space for growth in the schools. The tendency, therefore, is almost irresistible to treat problems in a merely distributive manner; to sink into the handling, and enjoyment, of power (simply because it's there and provides some ego satisfaction in the face of incipient and sometimes seemingly constant exasperation), and to develop an ethos of "administrative finesse."

On the other hand, the general thesis cited above is however an argument for a strategy of change which aims at a decisive breach in the continuity of a school administration. An across the board change in personnel, though usually necessary for success, is not any more important than an effort to deal a hard blow at the prevailing administrative ethos. Removing administrators, and eliminating the old ethos, must usually go hand in hand.

If such strategy is followed up with a determined effort to bring in and develop an administrative approach anchored in a growth-oriented distributive politics and with appointments of people who as a new team reflect this approach--then the opportunity for a real change in the schools is substantially enhanced.

School administrators are not the only key, but they are a crucially important key to substantive change. Heroic efforts by individual teachers, or by clusters of teachers, or even by whole segments of a school system, to introduce change-for-growth--such heroic efforts, if unaccompanied by thorough change in administrators and administrative ethos, are foredoomed. There may be six months, a year, two years of newness and seeming progress, but the rollback is inevitable. What comes from the top down, consciously and unconsciously (and it is the latter, unintended, pressures that are strongest and most lethal), remolds the new into the shape of the old, or into the shape of something worse than the old. Instead of a school for growth, it becomes a school for cynicism and the inbred pathos of human failure.

Further conclusions may be drawn from the data and the analyses of the data, and may be briefly stated here.

For example, it is clear that the role of beliefs, or values, in movements for change is important, but it also seems clear that they are not so central as humanists think, nor so peripheral as rigid Marxists imply. On the other hand, values which have had a chance to grow in practice and to some degree have become embodied in the structure of relationships, values in this sense have compelling "material" force. For another example, one can probably aim higher in a venture that is "outside the system" than in a program created within an existing and established institution. Nevertheless, differences in the process of effectuating, or embodying, change are not as great as might have been expected. One does not escape "politics" by moving outside the system, nor the problems of compromise, nor the need for strategy, nor the need to foster consciousness as distinct from only applying it, nor the many and at times vividly expressed contradictions that divide people from each other and from themselves. The dialectics of rebellion are as applicable to ventures outside as to those inside the system. Perhaps a more creative development of that dialectic is possible in the former than in the latter, but that is hard to judge or to measure. It has much to do with the height of the aim, the general social environment, and the consciousness--and capacity for expansion of consciousness--of the participants.

And, a last example, it was the problem of authority and of anti-authority, and the related passion for freedom, which seemed most to arouse the will to rebel in the minds and hearts of people in all four programs studied. Who controls, how is control exercised, what does control mean, how ought power to be concentrated or shared and under what guidelines, who is doing what to whom, these and many similar questions seemed to be experienced and perceived as absolutely critical to the possibilities for growth. It also proved to be the touchiest and thorniest problem for the leaders of programs once the programs were launched. It was a point of conflict between leaders and participants in all of the programs studied. But often as not the conflict went underground, became subterranean, something more felt than talked about. Other problems would come to the fore and would crowd this one out--problems such as educational performance; professional status; working conditions in the limited sense of achieving fair and efficient time and space arrangements; opportunities for advancement; career counselling; assuring broad participation (on the order of "let's get everybody involved"); scheduling; salary adjustments; equal sharing of the work load; and so on and so forth. One may as readily say, nevertheless, that the coming to the fore of these concerns was a reflex action on the part of leader-as-administrator seeking to deflect attention from power realities (his or her power), as to say that the participants were really more concerned with these other matters. Their apparently greater concern may well have been a function of a realistic assessment on their part of the realities of the power relations that were building up, matched by an unwillingness to encounter it. That this tended to happen much less in Collins Brook School and Freeport Elementary and much more in Brunswick and in Upward Bound is another way of saying that the first two programs were more thoroughgoing in their will to design situations in which human beings can and must act-for-growth through free social--that is, structural--interaction and exchange.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

A questionnaire entitled "Your Concept of Change" was given to 110 people who had earlier been interviewed. The questionnaire is reproduced in this appendix.

I and my assistants in the project tried first to score the returns on the basis of many categories implicitly or explicity contained in the thirteen sets of opposing viewpoints comprising the questionnaire--such as "favors rapid change," "believes in strong leadership," "is oriented towards the inner person," "considers structural alteration the critical component," "is in a state of self-perceived conflict with the practice of the program," and so forth. We were planning on that basis to derive a number of profiles, apply these to the respondents in each project, and see whether the profiles confirmed or disconfirmed conclusions arrived at, concerning these projects, that were based on the data gained through interviewing, observation, reading documents, etc. To a degree we did that, but instead of scoring questionnaires all together and across the board, and thus in some fashion quantitatively, we read each individual questionnaire separately and as a whole and tried to relate it to the person-in-action as we knew about him or her from the other data. This seemed more appropriate and more effective in terms of yield, because of the complexity and multifarious nuances in the questionnaire, and because the respondents tended to write substantial commentaries of their own in response to various parts of the questionnaire that especially aroused their interest. This feedback was as important to work into the profile of the respondent as his or her answers to the questions as asked.

As an experiment, I asked one of my assistants, Mark Terison, a Bowdoin College Senior, a political science major, and himself first a member and then chairman of the School Board in Falmouth, Maine, to do a number of individual profiles of people in the programs studied. I wanted to check out whether his independent reading of the questionnaire would lead him to set down estimates of a leader's overall viewpoint and posture in the program that would or would not vary from my own. I have included fourteen of his profiles.

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PARTICIPANTS, PLANNERS, SUPERVISORY PERSONNEL, AND OBSERVERS OF EDUCATIONAL CHANGE PROGRAMS

Research Project: #2A039: "The Process of Effecting Change: How Aims Work Out in Practice in Four Change Programs in Education in Mid-Coast Maine."

John Rensenbrink
Project Director
Bowdoin College
Brunswick, Maine

I'd like your name
if that's ok with you.

____

QUESTIONNAIRE: YOUR CONCEPT OF CHANGE

To the students, teachers, parents, school administrators, school board members and others who have participated by means of interviews in this research project:

I am asking you to follow up on the interview we have had by filling out this questionnaire and returning it to me in the self-addressed and stamped envelope by May 1, 1973.

The questionnaire has grown out of the more than 120 interviews I have had during the past year. You will therefore readily recognize many of the things we've talked about.

I believe you will find this to be different from any questionnaire you've taken. I also believe that because it has the input of such a large number and variety of people that you will find it to be a challenging and rewarding experience.

A preliminary version of this questionnaire was given earlier to fourteen people. They liked it and gave me valuable criticism and feedback. I then revised it and drew on additional knowledge accumulating from the ongoing interviews.

A word of appreciation.

I doubt if I could find words to describe the deep sense of satisfaction and appreciation I feel for the depth and vitality of your contribution to this research project. I have the feeling that it "belongs" as much to you as to me. If and when a book comes out on this, it will be dedicated to you!

Introduction

(Please answer this first--after you've had a chance to scan the questionnaire.)

Under items 3 and 4 in each of the parts of the questionnaire below, the program I'm referring to is: (see Note directly below)

______ Jordan Acres
______ Bowdoin Upward Bound
______ Collins Brook School
______ Soule School
______ Other (please specify

Note: For many of you the choice of which program to specify is fairly clear--you are now, or were, a teacher or a student or an administrator or a parent, or a Board member concerned about, or an interested observer or an advisor of, one of the four programs listed.

But for others of you, a different identification may be more appropriate. It may be a program we've talked about in the interview. For example, it may be the middle school; or a program at the high school; or the Longfellow Spelling Program; or the Freeport Reading Program; or the elementary system in Freeport or Brunswick; or the school system as a whole in Freeport or Brunswick; or one's own self-contained classroom; etc. In that case check "Other" and specify.

There may be some cases in which you could specify one of the first four, and/or another entity as well. In that case specify both, or either one, as you prefer.

Part I. A Swift Versus a Gradual Approach

A. First Voice

"If one is going to institute something new, it is the better part of wisdom to do it swiftly. Now I don't mean in a hasty fashion, but once decided on a course of action you should try to move towards the target as directly and effectively as possible. If you don't, then your program will be whittled down; your energy will be sapped; the program will be subjected to one compromise after another, one little erosion after another. You'll wind up with something that has a new name perhaps, but not much else."

B. Second Voice

"It is important to do things gradually, to avoid impatience, to bend with the wind where necessary, to be prepared to be flexible, and to work steadily with people and situations so that you carry as many people along with you for as long as possible. And if you don't get everything you set out to accomplish--well, you have to realize that change is a long process."

1. I feel that my own views are

a._____ Very close to the first voice.

b._____ Moderately close to the first voice.

c._____ Very close to the second voice.

d._____ Moderately close to the second voice.

e._____ Different from both voices because I feel torn between them.

f._____ Different from both voices because I prefer the following alternative voice:

2. I feel that in my actual practice I am closer to

a._____ The first voice.

b._____ The second voice.

c._____ My alternative voice.

d._____ None of these, and I mean by that:

3. I perceive that the overall views of the program of change which I identified in the introduction are closer to

a._____ 1st voice.

b._____ 2nd voice.

c._____ My alternate voice.

d._____ None of these, and I mean by that:

4. I perceive that the overall practice of the program of change identified in the introduction is closer to

a._____ 1st voice.

b._____ 2nd voice.

c._____ My alternative voice.

e._____ None of these and I mean by that:

Part II. Strong Versus Moderate Planning

A. First Voice

"To put changes into effect, you need good plans and strategies. This doesn't mean that you are going to cross every t and dot every i beforehand, but it does mean that you must develop plans in some detail, know where you are going, and know approximately what you will do in the face of pressures, or unexpected contingencies.

"All this talk against planning things in advance sometimes seems to me to be the complaining of romantics or the lazy or both--people who seem to have a block against getting into the 'messy details' of a work situation. Concern for doing your job well means that you do understand that the details are crucial; that you do understand that the very complexity of details means that they should be identified as clearly as possible beforehand; and that you do recognize the need for a strong commitment to follow the pattern you've worked out. Of course you cannot do without a mature flexibility. But that's a lot different than 'playing it by ear.'"

B. Second Voice

"There is probably no way in which you can anticipate all the contingencies and nuances of putting something into practice. In that sense planning, working out sequentially rational steps in advance, and trying to calculate the desirable course of events that a program should follow--all of this becomes self-defeating. You are bound to get come-uppances time and again from the 'unexpected'--and then your timing and sense of momentum and your own creative attitude is thrown off center. It is good, however, to do some pre-planning; identify clearly your direction and priorities; do some general designing of the program; build in as much as possible a self-monitoring system that you can follow; even make rough sketches of detailed application, maybe more than one if you have time, in order to give you a sense of what to expect in practice. But beyond that, be wary of getting into all this planning. Learn also to rely on your own seasoned ability to work in new situations." [There follows in the actual questionnaire the same questions as for Part I above; similarly, for Parts III to XIII below.]

Part III. On Traditional Practices:"Don't Tamper Lightly" Versus "Be Ready to Throw Them Out."

A. First Voice

"Change, whatever it is, cannot, must not, fly in the face of the lessons of the past. This doesn't mean a slavish attitude towards what went on before but it does mean a decent respect for what has already been tried.

"I don't want to be pressured into doing something new just because its new. New-ness and gimmickry are near brothers these days. I need to work out a clear rationale so that the changes that are brought in do respect past traditions here--in this place where the changes are being tried. We who initiate changes must realize fully that practices deriving from the past--and now to be abandoned--had their rationale, too. And maybe they still do--because the problems those practices were invented to deal with, haven't necessarily gone away.

"True enough, the situation today is different, and there is a mix of old and new problems. Still, it seems to me that the innovations should be good enough to meet the situation better than what we've been doing--not just as well as, but better. Otherwise, why change?"

B. Second Voice

"Sure, the past has its uses, and past practices obviously had their rationale--and very likely still do to a degree. But there's an awful lot of inertia contained in past practice--as presently practiced! So that even good things invented in the past are no longer done in a fresh way, but have become a matter of rote.

"What frustrates me, and seems unfair, is that the burden of proof is always so much and so heavily on a new practice. Why shouldn't the burden of proof rest equally on established practice? I'd readily settle for that. It would give change a chance.

"I disagree that a proposed change has to prove that it can handle problems better than an existing practice. If it can do just as well, then that's a plus; something fresh has been injected into an inertial situation.

"Then there's the matter of attitude and disposition. To hang on to the old, or merely to modify the old because it seems good enough--this breeds, and is fed by, the psychology of fear, of timidity, of narrowness.

"The past so easily becomes a tyrant. Even heroes and greatness in the past become tyrannical if they are served up in a manner to suggest that we now can't do it better or be as great.

"So don't sanctify the past--give the new a fighting chance. Carve out a big enough space out of the old so that the new can grow."

Part IV. Should Behavioral Modification or Reaching the Inner Person Be the Central Aim?

A. First Voice

"It's very hard to understand another person, to get 'inside' his or her skull so to speak. And there's a very real point to be made about respecting privacy.

"This by way of saying that it's better to provide for the interaction of people with other people in terms of their behavior, with what they do and say in a variety of situations. Of course it's important to provide for that variety where it doesn't exist.

"I believe that you help people change by seeking modifications in behavior. It is unwise and inefficient--and this is certainly true for schools--to probe for insight about the supposed underlying 'causes' for given sets of behavior 'inside' the person. When a person has learned to do something in a new way; when a person learns to talk and write in a clearer and fresher language; when a person reacts to people and situations more directly because he or she's 'caught on' to how that can be done--then he or she is changing, behaves more effectively.

"It is very possible that he or she then also develops out of this a better sense of self, and a better self-sustaining ability to relate to others. This is a good by-product of the effort to bring about change; it should be very much a part of the concern of the educator; but it should not become the central aim."

B. Second Voice

"Well I must say this is a tough issue. But it strikes me that if self-determination of the person is a major priority, then reliance on behavioral modification to 'get there from here' is not very plausible--however tempting and simple it seems. For the result in kids and grown-ups alike is more on the order of 'I like me because I can do so and so!' rather than 'I like me; and (therefore) I can do so and so.'

"Change programs ought to be very concerned with the inner weather of the person, and should develop attitudes and approaches that can lead to a greater awareness and sense of self. One needn't blunder into these things; there are ways now of helping the person to deal more directly with the typical fears and psychic blocks that undermine self-acceptance and self-development.

"This requires some basic changes in the usual way in which nowadays classrooms are organized, and in which teachers relate to kids and vice versa--changes along the lines of more open-ness, more emphasis on creating trust, more emphāsis on relating to the whole person even when dealing with a particular skill or lesson, and so on. Modifying behavior, as such, does not get you there very easily. Indeed one can learn, 'catch on to,' new behaviors with facility and yet never really experience a loosening of the grip of those deep-seated fears or those manifold psychic blocks that will drag you down in the end. Schools have got to deal with that in a far more direct way than heretofore. If they don't, people will not be strong enough to counter the pressure towards conformity, no matter how impressive change programs are in every other way.

"This does not preclude concern with behavior as a necessary complement to concern with the inner person. Both are important. But there must be a clear emphasis on the latter."

Part V. Of the Heart And Of the Mind

A. First Voice

"To put first and foremost the excitement, and the heady freedom, of wide-ranging ideas is a pretty presumptuous thing to do to kids--unless you have also enabled them to integrate these abstract 'head trips' emotionally and culturally as they go along.

"To introduce accurate ideas about Mao's China may seem an exciting and responsible thing to do in a classroom ('shall not the truth make you free?' comes to mind in defense of this). But suppose it puts a kid in a state of deep conflict with what his parents devoutly believe? This is not necessarily an argument not to tell the truth about Mao's China. But it is a caveat directed at those who say the school is first and foremost a place of ideas and concepts (rational understandings and skills) and who often add 'let's keep the emotional factors, or the "irrational" beliefs and fears of parents, out of it as much as possible.'

"Let's go further with this example of 'Mao's China.' What probably happens is, the kid tunes out 'Mao's China.' It's too much weight to carry. So he gets lower grades. And he doesn't go to college. Let's fill it in some more. His parents are working class or poor. They are not the wealthy educated in whose homes 'Mao's China,' though still perceived as a powerful antagonist, is no immediate threat for a variety of reasons. Many of these reasons have to do with the formation of a highly verbal gloss on the world, and a ready-made familiarity with having ideas, appropriate to upper and upper-middleclass life. Kids from such homes, given ordinary intelligence, have less trouble with 'Mao's China.' It should be evident that the intellectualist approach to education tends to be class biased.

"In fact 'Mao's China' can be replicated a thousand times over--at all levels of the educational process from the kindergarten through college (and beyond?). 'Mao's China' is a symbol for anything of substantive academic content--be it in whatever subject--which is given by the teacher, or received by the learner, in a manner that makes it too heavy or too blinding or too dangerous for the student to assimilate. This, not because he's dumb, but because his person is not ready to absorb it.

"This suggests the need to help kids move from 'where they are' emotionally and culturally, as well as intellectually, so that knowledge can grow in them in a more integrated and balanced way."

B. Second Voice

"So you want to help people change?--kids, parents, teachers, administrators? Some or all? Well, try to give them, help them come to, a better grasp of the world they are living in--a better grasp of the natural, social and psychological world around them, and in them. Stretch their minds. Get them 'hooked' on learning! Enlarge their ability to compare themselves to other peoples, societies, and other ways of doing things.

"Help them get at an understanding of human society, for example, which relates how things done differently in different societies may have a common rationale. That sort of thing. Or help youngsters move through mathematics in a variety of ways. Help them to approach and do conceptualizing in as natural a way as possible. Encourage them in these and similar ways to strengthen and expand their minds. Have classrooms that literally buzz with ideas. Expose them to a variety of things to do and see. Learn freely about the world.

"Traditional education, for all its stress on intellectual achievement and measurable excellence, has tended to be myopic on the question of the open quest for knowledge--too content with established curricula, too content with ideas always a generation old, not alert to the changing world and the fact that as that world changes, our perceptions of ourselves and our past changes too.

"On the other hand some 'newer' concepts seem to abandon intellectual concern, and down-peddle the quest for accurate ideas in favor of an emotional approach to learning. This may be stuff for group therapy or religious activity, but schools can only degenerate into intellectual barbarism under the impact of such concepts in practice.

"So that I'm an advocate of the old (but forever new) notion that school is a place where you learn to think and develop your mind."

Part VI. Primary Concern for Structure and Focus Versus Primary Concern for Variety of Opportunity and "Letting Be."

A. First Voice

"I'm not for traditional structuring; and I am for opening things up a lot. But there is a way of doing this which can leave the child without moorings, and without a sense of direction. Yet this is often done in change programs in the name of giving the kid choices and helping him make decisions. Frequently this may mean not pushing the child very much at all, allowing him all kinds of space and time to 'make up his mind.' Frequently, as well, this may mean exposing the child to a great variety of things to do and become interested in, but without very much guidance as to what is more important in a general sense--and as to what is more important for that child now, both in terms of his interests now and his long-range needs.

"I believe that a teacher has a responsibility: one, to help a kid move in directions that meet his long-range needs; two, to help him focus now on the more important rather than tho less important, no matter how 'interesting' the latter may seem to be; and three, once choices are made, to help him pursue a subject or topic thoroughly.

"Otherwise, we are gambling with the life-career of a child, and we become wasteful of the time, energy, and money of a lot of people."

B. Second Voice

"It's amazing how easily we get trapped into making the same old mistakes. We say we want the self-development of the learner. And then we come in with our own parental and teacherish biases to point the learner here or there, or suggest that he might find gold there, '...and hey come along, I'll take you to the gold! See! Isn't it exciting!'

"There's plausibility in this of course, and some can handle it--teachers and learners. But the danger is profound--that we blunt the very power of self-discovery whose beauty and autonomy and strength we say we put at the very heart of our enterprize! It's safer and better to expose the learner to a whole kaleidoscope of stimuli: a variety of ideas, a variety of methods and techniques (traditional as well as new-fangled ones!), a variety of situations--some to observe, some to experience for him or herself.

"If this exposure is to be bona fide, the teacher has got to back off from all sorts of impulses stemming from the deeply nurtured disposition to intervene in another person's life for that person's good.

"With that clearly understood and felt, the teacher may then--and only then--'help' the learner in any number of ways: to support choices, to reflect sympathetically back to the learner conflicts that arise in the learner; to expand with additional knowledge points of knowledge already begun in the learner (though here again watch out!) and so forth.

"The best knowledge available for teacher and student is this: that growth in learning is accomplished by the learner, not invented and engendered by the teacher. And if that means going in much more zigzaggier ways than is thought appropriate by the defenders of 'focus!' well, that's o. k.!

"I'm not against focus, but I want it to emerge as the child grows, and not be something the child has had defined for him by somebody else."

Part VII. Primary Concern to "Reach Upward" Versus Primary Concern to Deal with "Now."

A. First Voice

"There's no doubt that life is a matter of movement, and the subjective experience of human beings is very much oriented towards doing things better than before, or at any rate moving from one point or level of life to another which is seen (in advance) as something good to strive for.

"School is part of life (thunderous cliché! but not less true for that reason) and is thus organized, on a continuum shall we say?, from lower, simpler, or younger levels (take your pick), to higher, more complex, older levels. And school obviously points beyond itself to further training or directly to jobs and careers in which also there is this movement from 'here' to 'there.' So that kids/people are in a state of taking steps.

"Unless one as teacher or parent or administrator, or anyone connected to education--unless one sees the kid as involved in a whole process of moving from kindergarten onwards, and of moving from where one is teaching him to where he's going next, one really hasn't grasped his or her needs. When put in this context it may be seen how crucial it is to help the kid take the next step--to prepare him for that.

"You don't have to be an anxious, clucking, hovering personage, badgering the kids with veiled, and not so veiled, threats that unless he performs 'he don't make it' to the next step or grade or whatever. I'm not talking about such gaucherie. But the teacher and the school is responsible to assist the child in becoming more fully aware of where he or she is going and of the challenge of moving onward. This I firmly believe."

B. Second Voice

"What is the difference between the felt need to achieve and anxiety? In real life terms now, not in some airy fairy theory that can always draw neat distinctions between things! Maybe anxiety is a good thing, as some people hold, because it is a strong goad. But to what end? To take the next step and to strive ever onward, comes the answer.

"But isn't that an endless end, not unlike the eternal treadmill--off of which you do fall eventually? Even if the treadmill spirals, what's that? and at what cost is this endless end pursued, the cost in the destruction of the person, the cost in the erosion of his or her sense of self as a living, self-moving being? The feeling of having to move on, having to do this now in order to get to the next point, is an anxious feeling usually. People do perform under those circumstances and in such an atmosphere, but so often they turn into consumers of life, no time to pause and savor it, to feel it if you will, as it goes coursing by.

"So that if education is to help persons grow, instead of helping robots to succeed, then you've got to turn it around. You have to ask--first of yourself--what are you putting first? Are you sugar-coating the irrepressible 'achievement syndrome' with words and apparent techniques of personal growth, but actually in your daily work you give off all kinds of messages on the order of 'let's do this *now* so that you'll be able to do *that* later?'

"Now, I can't conceive of that concern being *absent* in the teaching/learning process. It should be there. But if it's the preponderent concern (let's say 49% and up!) then you are teaching for achievement and not necessarily (probably not at all) for growth of the person. And if the achievement/performance syndrome is locked into a kid at an early age then it is progressively more and more difficult at any later time to unlock that--*or* to unlock the *anti*-achievement syndrome of kids who were turned off at an early age to any learning at all because of traumas with achievement-dominated situations.

"So I make a plea, an argument, for helping the child move with a certain amount of rhythm in the present experience--helping him or her to savor the life of the present, having him or her help you do the same. In our teaching we should be creating and sustaining an atmosphere in which the natural curiosity of human beings can flourish--unhurriedly but with deep excitement--and to take the risks that go with that, such as wasting time, sustaining the anxious pressures of parents and superiors that Johnny isn't, or might not be, reading 'up to his level,' etc., etc."

art VIII. New Bottles or Old?

A. First Voice

"After much trying and getting your come-uppance in a lot of ways, you may at last arrive at wisdom. The wisdom I mean is the realization in your bones that no change can come in the absence of change in structure.

"Not physical plant and design, now--though that may be involved. Nor do I limit the concept of structure to organization of classrooms, administrative patterns and flow charts; or identification of roles and responsibilities. I mean to include also, beyond that, what those studying British political institutions for example call the 'unwritten constitution.' Another term might be 'the mold of practice.' That is, 'how things are done around here and who does them and when.' This is structure too--a subtle undercurrent to the casual observer but, in most cases, a powerful tide to those actually within the structure, more real even than the more overt manifestations of structure referred to earlier. In most cases people within the structure are unaware of this powerful tide, which increases, of course, its power.

"Oftentimes a person in a school or in any institution for that matter can be doing nothing that is not in accord with the overt structure and apparent methods of operation and yet be tagged as anti-establishment--because in many telltale ways it becomes evident that he or she does not fit the prevailing 'mold of practice.'

"That's reality. One's efforts to change things, if they're going to be effective at all, will meet the resistance of the 'mold of practice.' Unless you somehow succeed in changing the mold of practice, the changes you do accomplish are ephemeral. So it's extremely frustrating. Movement is glacial. You can get hurt quite badly, and often before you know it.

"So the point of all this is to build new alternative structures, not to fiddle around with old ones. This doesn't necessarily mean 'giving up on the system;' it does mean trying to show the system something better."

B. Second Voice

"Impatience is almost an occupational disease among people concerned about change. It clouds the perception that things are moving, more than you think. You may gripe about the inertia of institutions--but have you clarified your head, have you purged your gut of the self-pitying whine and the 'who, me? I'm too weak!' syndrome? Have you patiently marshalled your resources and gone about the ordinary and ornery business of changing institutions from within?

"It takes commitment of time and energy to outlast the drones, to mollify or sidestep the ingrained, to reassure and encourage the fearful, and to sort out your seeming from your real enemies. It takes a sober awareness of the realities of power, especially of your own; and it takes a willingness to use power in as timely and non-threatening a manner as possible. With this you may even accomplish a minor revolution--but in any case you will have affected in some way the lives of people over the long haul, and not frittered your energies away in pure and noble adventures.

"Structures change slowly--that is true. But do they change any faster because *you* write them off? And don't they stay the same partly because *you* are not *there*?"

Part IX. Primary Emphasis on Individual Change versus Primary Emphasis on Structural Change

A. First Voice

"The analysis of what structure means was given above (#VIII) by the first voice, and I agree with that. If anything, I'd emphasize even more strongly the power which is exercised in institutions by the prevailing 'mold of practice.'

"This suggests to me that individuals as individuals are basically helpless in trying to bring about change. They may be really able and strong and resourceful and patient and even politically insightful and prudent, but the sheer weight of the institution is against them. Their innovations remain insulated from the rest of the system. Or, they may go beyond that to become adopted in some form by the system. But such partial successes become no more than piecemeal changes that readily fit in with the prevailing mold of practice and make it look better and even feel better for awhile.

"I believe in the concept of 'critical mass.' Before new ideas can really work in practice, there has to be developed a substantial structural support for them. This applies as much to innovational efforts outside the system as to those within the system.

"For those outside the system it means facing up to the sometimes unpalatable truth that change in a desired direction is not a matter of letting individuals 'do their own thing'--but that structural form and focus is necessary (and inevitable in any case!).

"For those within the system it means a consciousness and a will to struggle for and develop significant sub-structures, and once they are created, to have the sense to see that the continued autonomy of such sub-structures is a primary pre-condition for the success of the innovational program.

"Of course, it would be even finer to be able to get enough support to gain the levers of power in the institution as a whole and start initiating the changes that would transform the structure. But that's very hard to do. And besides you court the danger of 'top-down-ism' and counter-rebellion.

"In any case--the question of structure is fundamental."

B. Second Voice

"One can put too much emphasis on structures. Institutions are made up of individuals. It is their hopes and fears and energies and enthusiasms that make the difference. They can be touched, influenced, motivated. Even a few in an institution can, by the example of their individual actions, spread the word to many others; and thus, gradually to be sure, important and far-reaching changes take place in the entire institution, including in every way its structures.

"Much can be done by perceptive and timely leadership. Such leadership can give scope and support to innovative teachers, without raising barriers or creating invidious distinctions, and thus help along the process of change.

"An emphasis on structural change tends to polarize things and people. It easily threatens the always fragile stability of institutions. It over-dramatizes change; whereas change should always be made to seem as being in a line of progressive continuity with present ptactice.

"So that change programs should emphasize the individual, his talents, responsibilities and opportunities. Then systems will inevitably change, too."

rt X. Primary Emphasis on Scholarly Excellence Versus Primary Emphasis on Community Consciousness.

A. First Voice

"Change doesn't happen overnight--we all know that. But if there is to be change, say in the schools, then somehow you will have to encounter eventually the problems of inertia, conventionalism, ingrained and provincial attitudes of the community in which your school is situated. If you don't face up to this, then neither will you stay aware of how much these prevailing cultural ways stifle the life of the school--and undermine every day your steady efforts to give the kids in your classroom a sense of alternatives, intimations of new ways of doing things and of looking at life; in a word, a breath of fresh air. You will be dragged down and become every man's and every woman's stereotype of the dreary teacher.

"Your responsibility as a teacher is to the unfolding and opening out of the kids in your professional charge. If this process yields unhappy, troubled, pained moments for parents, then this is something you should expect and develop the capability of handling it. And above all you should try to get your peers, teachers associations, administrators, and school committees to develop a similar capability.

"The boldest, and maybe the best, way is to carry the argument straight back to the community; to wit, that education to be anything at all means growth and that growth is often difficult and painful. Once the community can (must, if they are serious about education) accept this, then particular cases where a parent thinks a teacher went too far or where a teacher thinks a parent is mistaken, can be handled in a spirit of mutual awareness--including the awareness of the legitimacy of the school as a growth agent. Then a fair decision can be made--of where the teacher is 'wrong' or the parent is 'mistaken.'

"Alas we're not at that point! True, but will we ever get there so long as schools run scared of the 'culture of the community?' So let's emphasize the school's basic responsibility to scholarly excellence!"

B. Second Voice

"The school exists in a particular social and cultural milieu. Kids from that milieu go to school and every day they meet there people and methods, and concepts, and ideas which both reflect the familiar milieu and which go beyond it, towards something less familiar, something that may seem novel, strange, exciting and possibly threatening.

"This it seems to me is a normal, healthy situation. But things can happen to mar that; e.g., too much newness, too quickly. It doesn't help the great majority of kids for the schools to get too far out in front, too abruptly, of the cultural assumptions and well-established norms and beliefs of the parents of the kids you are trying to teach. Out in front, yes, when occasion demands--but not too far, or you will lose in backlash what you thought you were gaining with your kids by your honesty, boldness and steady conviction.

"Another difficulty is insensitivity--or call it lack of cultural rapport. It's conceivable to me that a school, or even a single classroom, could move quite far out in front of the prevailing milieu, if the educators involved really begin from a respect for the ways and beliefs of the community, and can communicate that. This presupposes some real understanding of these ways and these beliefs, and a willingness to understand why they exist.

"It takes considerable strength both to understand something, and to sustain a will to change it. But it seems to me that nothing less is required of the change agent if he or she really is to bring about change. Much has to do with one's inner attitude--whether or not there is empathy, humility, and an appreciation of people no matter who they are; and much depends on whether or not this inner attitude is successfully communicated.

"It is surprisingly, and tragically, easy for professionals to come off as arrogant, unsympathetic and know-it-all to the layman. It is equally and tragically easy for laymen to come off as stubborn, provincial, and irrational to the professional.

"Many things are needed to dissolve these stereotypes and reduce the mistrust--such as new training programs and new structures that facilitate greater understanding.

"What is badly needed is a new attitude among educators--an attitude which places far greater emphasis than hitherto on an understanding of, and a rapport with, the consciousness of a community."

Part XI. Teaching the Few (and the Many, Too) Versus Teaching Everybody Equally.

A. First Voice

"We are successful with some of our students. They tend to be the brightest, the most able to learn, the most perceptive, the strongest--plus some of those with high potential who because of disadvantages or particular blocks haven't learned to function effectively, but who with our help--and it makes us glow--begin to unlock that potential and grow swiftly. It is these we educate, a smaller or larger number from any given classroom as the case may be, but they constitute a minority.

"We're supposed to say we try to educate everyone, and that education is for all. We're not really supposed to hint out loud what is the real truth of the matter. Yet our practice daily, and overall, confirms the fact that the educational process favors those who can best make use of it.

"We don't reach the rest--not in that way. Oh sure, some get directed into vocational training. Most get to do acceptable math, language arts, history, economics, and so forth. But almost none of them grasp the concepts, or ideas relating to those concepts. Almost none of them seem to have, or be able to reach towards, the mind and imagination that goes beyond a learning of certain techniques which through repetition one can master and reproduce.

"So in our teaching we do provide for 'all,' but in different ways--for most we provide the encouragement and mastery of skills that enables them to learn a variety of motions. It's dull work basically.

"For the few we can provide something different--and it is 'more;' a lively and imaginative and skillful understanding of the world and its processes.

"Unhappy and frustrated and I'd add foolish is the teacher who does not, or is unwilling to understand this, who--believing the myth--tries to do for all what he or she can only do for some."

B. Second Voice

"In spite of the rhetoric of equality, schools continue to favor the few. We divide (and in so many subtle ways!) according to performance and our grading of performance is inevitable in terms of the acquisition of academic skills and understanding. These tend to be self-fulfilling categories--one invents these categories and then people fill them!

"Furthermore, equality of opportunity is translated into the 'equal chance' of everyone among the disadvantaged, and the many ethnic minorities, to compete for the academic escalator. If you are 'bright' or 'potentially bright and lucky' you will vault into the select elite circles.

"What do our schools do at present? First, and primarily, they socialize children into accepting the superior destiny of some and the inferior destiny of the remainder.

"Secondly, schools try to achieve excellence of scholarship. This is roughly translated into academic performance. But academic performance in turn is used primarily as a tool to instill the belief in the 'natural' character of superior and inferior 'destinies.' Some good scholarship does rub off and is accomplished. But even so, schools only scratch the surface in exploring with even the 'bright kids' how nature works, how society works, how individual communities work, and how human beings do, or could, interact with technology.

"Thirdly, the schools try to stimulate and support personal growth. But this runs a poor third in most cases, and is usually brought in 'afterwards.'

"Many change programs try to re-order the priorities and they put a strong new emphasis on personal growth. By itself this is not enough. I feel we need to combine this new emphasis with a serious effort to match up the matter and style of teaching with the present and future needs of a dynamic, industrial society. This means dealing with and relating to the actual problems and conflicts in our society and communities as well as meeting more operational and functional needs.

"Put in this light, there is need for schools that are able to ask and live with questions, rather than always trying to dispose of them 'in advance' in well ordered and packaged answers; a need for teaching and giving equal status to a variety of people-skills as well as thing-skills; a need for making the academic a more 'practical' experience;

conversely, a need for making the vocational a more theoretical experience; and, finally, a need to help kids and other people to 'get the hang of' exploring problems together where every personal input is valued.

"These are only some examples of a kind of schooling in which phony (socially contrived) distinctions are not as likely to manifest themselves. It is a kind of schooling where kids with different (not superior or inferior) aptitudes, temperaments, interests and capabilities can all participate and achieve.

"Some will do better, some worse, but more relative to different skills and situations, and less absolutely than at present. And my point is, that schools, instead of reinforcing and even creating inequality as at present, can be a vital force against it. This to me is the touchstone of a change program."

Part XII. Schools as Agents of Social Change Versus Schools as Preparers of Future Citizens.

A. First Voice

"Perhaps it is true that in the past schools have been transmitters of a society's traditions and of the skills in the arts and sciences needed by society.

"I believe however that a new emphasis is needed. Schools need to be more dynamic and to interact more with society. I identify with a lot of what the second voice said above (Part XI) in connection with equality. What that suggests is a more 'open campus' type of schooling.

In such schooling there is much more of a two-way flow between school and community--a flow of information; a flow of shared knowledge of problems and conflicts; and therefore also more understanding, more ease, and a much greater sense of mutual problem solving.

"Another important part of this is a clearer, franker emphasis by the schools on their role and responsibility in directly fostering social change. This to me means educating kids and communities in the process of finding answers to problems and educating them in the knowledge of what can be done about those problems, as this knowledge emerges out of the process.

"But this must go hand in hand with the 'open campus' concept. 'Open campus' provides a basis for real communication and trust, trust that comes from a genuine understanding of problems and of the conflicts that often underlie them. Without trust, the quest for new solutions, and the effort to communicate them by the schools, is very difficult and fraught with danger. It is often seen by the community as merely ivory tower posturing and adventurism--and it often merely is, because there has been no vital input from the community.

"In short, I believe we must go forward to make the schools a much more dynamic factor than hitherto in the process of social change."

B. Second Voice

"The argument that wants the school to be an agent of social change is often beguiling, if not always compelling.

"But the school can't do everything. We have political parties. We have a myriad number of pressure groups. We have private organizations dedicated to the pursuit of the public interest.

"The function of the school, by contrast, is to teach skills, to foster basic social and human values, to help kids grow personally, and to help them learn how to think so that when they become adult citizens they will be well prepared to tackle the problems of our society.

"We muddy the waters by asking the schools to take on additional functions, however noble and useful these tasks may seem. Education and social change are related, but they are very different kinds of activities."

Part XIII. On Leadership: The Lion and/or The Fox Versus an "Open" Type of Leadership.

A. First Voice

"Change programs need fairly strong personalities, especially in the beginning stages. If the 'cake of custom' is to be broken, it takes a person with a fair amount of flair and boldness; a person imbued with a keen sense of NEW goals, however generalized these may be; a person who is able to inspire loyalty to these goals among what are usually a small group of followers; and a person who projects a more diffuse but contagious sense of dynamism to a much wider number. Such a person is familiarly known as a charismatic figure.

"Usually, however, such a figure has limited usefulness. He makes enemies easily, his tactics tend to be abrupt, and he doesn't have much patience for details. Another type is also needed--one who is more peaceable in his manners, less predictable, more given to the finer arts of in-fighting and gentle persuasion--more subtle if you will; also able to be a broker when conflicts arise, and able to function efficiently on a daily, operational basis. He has been called, in contrast to the charismatic, the pragmatic type.

"Some leaders are specially gifted in being able to develop both a charismatic and a pragmatic style. They can, if well practiced, use either one or the other, depending on the situation. Or, they may even be able to combine elements of both at the same time, so that the inspiring roar of the lion blends with the skillful cunning of the fox to produce a desired result. But of course that's rare.

"Usually leaders are not that flexible or can't overcome the tendency of the press and of people in general to type them in one direction or another. Therefore, in most cases, change programs need both types of leadership and have to know when to choose one or the other in order to be successful."

B. Second Voice

"I am going to make a strong observation, and maybe that's 'charismatic' of me--but I believe that the charismatic type, the pragmatic type, and the style that tries for a balance of both, are all manipulative. This may not be an argument against their being needed. However, I'll try to sketch my own concept of leadership in change situations. Then one can judge which is most consistent with the spirit and substance of change.

"I don't know what name to give to this type: Integrative? Interpretive? Mediatory? Prudent--in the older Aristotelian sense? Not quite, but close.

"He or she is a person of steady commitment to goals. The goals are experienced and pursued not as a 'holy' crutch but as a place on which to stand and from which to move.

"Furthermore, he or she is a person who has a facility for 'listening with' a variety of persons and groups in and out of the program, many of whom often have different needs, interests, and perspectives, and who are or could be in a state of conflict.

"Such a leader aims, not at brokerage, but at growth. Thus, rising out of this faculty of 'listening with,' there should be present in this type of leader the courage and the skill to interpret different persons and groups to one another; and--a vital point if change is to occur--to interpret each one severally and all together to the goals of the program; and in turn to facilitate new understandings of the goals as they are being put into practice.

"This further requires conveying a spirit of working with people instead of having them sense that they are working for a boss, or a 'great leader.'

"The leader needs awareness of self-in-action, at least to the degree that he or she knows that there is a gap between what he thinks he practices and what he actually does practice--and that effective leadership in the program requires a continuing struggle to close that gap.

"So that this model of leadership also requires open-ness, the strength to share, and the perceptiveness to know the difference between situations where open-ness should and can be freely sought and situations that need more careful nurturing--that need a practice and testing period that can then lead to the possibility of greater open-ness. In this regard, such leadership points towards the gradual reduction of specified leadership roles.

"Finally, this model--since it occurs in a change, and therefore, high risk situation--has in it elements of the fox, and maybe the lion too, to enhance the leader's effectiveness in supplying sufficient protective coloration to the program as a whole. These lion-like or fox-like behaviors are skills acquired by such a leader, mostly through experience. They are to be used by him or her as instruments of defense in specific circumstances. They do not define the substance of his leadership.

"I have not tried to identify all the characteristics of this type of leadership. But I wanted to bring out those which most clearly distinguish it from those described and admired by the first voice above. If pressed for a name for the type I prefer, I might call it the open style of leadership, though I'm not sure if that's quite it either.

"Does such leadership exist? No. It's an 'ideal type'--just like the others are. But social reality exhibits evidence of elements of such a type of leadership. In addition, there are individuals here and there who exhibit many of these elements, and have the spirit of moving in this direction.

"So that, to sum up, I believe I am justified in concluding that change programs need this kind of leadership, and that we can, with some promise of success, begin to work for its more frequent and steady appearance in our schools and in our society."

Profiles - Mark Terison

Robert Cartmill (Freeport Superintendent of Schools, 1970 ff.)

Bob Cartmill, Superintendent of the Freeport School system, seems to have a clear view of the political and therefore educational realities in Freeport. For example, Bob indicates that he would prefer to imitate the "open" style of leadership described in the questionnaire, but he knows that his actual practice is closer to the "Lion/Fox" style and perhaps that approach, at least at the time Bob responded to the questionnaire, is the only kind of approach which will work in Freeport.

Cartmill also exhibits an understanding of what could be called the social realities in Freeport. He would rather concern himself with the present, insuring that a child learns the kinds of things that will be important to him or her today, as well as sometime in the future. But the pressures placed on the system force Cartmill to emphasize "reaching upward" in his actual practice: teach the children things that will help them to reach the next higher grade, get through high school, find a job, or get into college. Today will have to take care of itself.

Cartmill would also stress the school's role as an agent of social change, but instead he is forced to be concerned with its role in preparing future citizens.

Bob Cartmill's view toward change is summed up in his alternative response to the question of whether change should be swift or gradual. "[I]prefer to develop a climate for change," Bob writes. "[T]his atmosphere will allow change to take place as a continuing and as a natural process rather

Robert Cartmill (con't.)

than going through cyclical changes as in freezing, thawing, and refreezing."

In the final analysis, Cartmill sees limitations to education and he expresses his feeling this way: "I have real questions as to whether anyone can be taught to think. I suspect that school [instead] comes closer to harnessing, controlling, and releasing potential energies."

Jean O'Brien (Freeport School Board member, 1973 ff.)

Jean O'Brien distinguishes between what she thinks are two stages of change: the first swift, the other gradual. "Change," Jean suggests, "comes with both processes. I would prefer the first and. . .I feel that the first. . .is what causes change and the second is what must be done after change has happened." In other words, the initial shift in direction is swift, the details of implementing that shift come gradually. In regard to the Soule School program, Jean maintains that the gradual approach to implementing details "was not used enough once change happened."

Though she is always ready to change traditional practices, Jean tries to operate on this model: "If the practices in the past are a matter of rote--change must come. I agree that 'to hang on to the old' is bad. But there is good in some past practices and what is good should be continued."

Jean believes that despite the changes which the Soule School program represents in relation to other Freeport schools, there still seems to be a concern for structure rather than for "letting be." "I am not the teacher and the ones involved are a combination of both voices (structure v. letting be), but are aiming more to the second one. The problem," Jean thinks, "is that they have spent years teaching (or living) the first."

A special problem for Soule, in Jean's view, emerges in the question of community understanding. "I agree," she states, "that the school's basic responsibility is to

Jean O'Brien (con't.)

scholarly excellence. I also see the need to try to reeducate the town for better rapport between educators and parents. Unfortunately for the Soule Project. . .not enough meeting of the minds between the two groups happened." Soule is seen as working for structural changes to replace the existing system, a view and a course, Jean warns, "which might cause its downfall."

Phyllis Estes (Member of the "Pettit Board," Freeport, 1968-73.)

Phyllis Estes's responses to the questionnaire reveal a deep conflict between her own views and those which she sees espoused by the Freeport School System.

To begin with, Phyllis advocates a swift approach to change but perceives that changes occur only gradually in Freeport. "In some areas change was rapid and implemented right away, but change is still going on throughout the whole school system." Secondly, Phyllis favors strong planning for change and she sees Freeport as taking the moderate approach. "With a fluctuating school board, the best of planning sometimes goes askew, but you can't beat thorough planning ahead."

A third point of conflict is the area of traditional educational practice. Phyllis agrees with the voice which calls for always being ready to throw out stagnant techniques in favor of fresh ideas. To the statement that the past so easily becomes a tyrant, Phyllis scribbles an enthusiastic "Amen!" She finds that the tendency in Freeport, however, is not to tamper lightly.

Fourth, Phyllis thinks that the school system views "reaching the inner person" as an unimportant educational aim, an aim she holds to be central to the educational process.

Next, Phyllis maintains that Freeport schools place too much emphasis on a child's reaching the next higher level rather than on dealing with the present in a child's life, though she qualifies her viewpoint by saying ". . .we have to look at the different schools." Apparently, the Soule School, in her opinion, comes closest to helping a child deal with his present situation.

Finally, Phyllis wants to see the schools act as agents for social change, but in Freeport she sees them as "preparers of future citizens," a role articulated by an opposing voice.

Phyllis's views and her perceptions of the Freeport School System are compatible in regard to working for change within the present structure rather than seeking to change that structure, and in emphasising changes in individuals over changes in structure. Structure, for Phyllis, is summed up this way: "A teacher should be a guide, not a god, but most children do need and want this guidance. In raising my own children, I have allowed them to experiment, sometimes with disastrous results, but I've tried to trust my belief that it's the long range results that are important in the life of a child."

Joyce Hopkins (Principal of Soule School. Freeport, 1969 ff.)

Joyce Hopkins finds herself in what seems to be an ideal situation. She is able to work out her views and aims in actual practice and she is in consistent agreement with the Soule School program in Freeport, the change program with which she is closely associated.

Joyce agrees with the voice which advocates swift change and moderate planning and she is always ready to throw out traditional practices in favor of new ones. Joyce emphasizes reaching the inner person over behavior modification, variety of opportunity or "letting be" over structure, dealing with "now"over concerns for "reaching upward", working within the system over building new structures, and individual over structural changes. She supports the concept of schools serving as social change agents and believes that Soule is playing that role. In fact, she perceives Soule School as emphasizing all the values and viewpoints which she herself emphasizes in the questionnaire.

When it comes down to understanding the community consciousness, Joyce is not able to put her views into practice. She believes that the school should work to understand the community--to break down the barriers between the professional and the layman--but in practice, neither of the voices quite suits her and she says "I'm scared and insecure." Maybe change breeds fright and insecurity--at least in Freeport!

In leadership Joyce also has difficulty practicing what she believes. She advocates the "open style" of leadership

Joyce Hopkins (con't.)

which one of the voices describes, but, she writes, "[I'm] not clever enough to be what I'd like to be."

Marcia Keith (Elementary Supervisor, Freeport, 1970-73; Principal of Morse Street Elementary School, Freeport, 1973 ff.)

Marcia Keith favors a gradual approach to educational change with moderate planning. She warns, however, that one should "compromise only to the point that can be accepted in conscience." Marcia believes in working for change within existing structure and she would emphasize changes in the individual over structural changes.

There are a number of instances where Marcia is not able to practice her views because of the Freeport situation. For example, Marcia agrees with the voice that says that the burden of proof should rest equally on established and new practices, rather than always having to prove that new techniques are better than existing ones. In practice, however, Marcia is forced to maintain a respect for past traditions, not tampering lightly--if at all--with present programs. Another example is found in Marcia's view that everybody should be taught with equal attention. She has problems working this aim out in practice. "I'm trying to work these out together--the difficult part is supplying the input necessary for the second voice (teaching everybody equally) to be enacted." Marcia sees the Soule School as coming the closest to the ideal of teaching everybody equally, but still there are problems. "In many respects, academic emphasis still slots kids--not enough other options [are] available at this point."

The same problem of not being able to work her views out in practice confronts Marcia again in the question concerning the school's proper role. Marcia feels that schools should

Marcia Keith (con't.)

act as agents of social change. In actual practice, however, she is closer to the views expressed by the voice which maintains that schools should serve to prepare future citizens, again because of the realities in Freeport. Marcia perceives this same division in the Soule School program itself--the program's views are more toward making the school a vehicle for social change, but its actual practice is to prepare the students for future citizenship. It is the conflict between views and practice which clearly dominates Marcia's answers to the questionnaire.

Doris Wladimiroff (Director of Upward Bound Program, Bowdoin College, 1967 ff.)

Doris likes to see swift change, especially in Upward Bound. If one does not move swiftly, Doris writes, then "kids--live kids (600,000--not just the 24,000 annually in Upward Bound) will never even have the puny experience that Upward Bound offers to help 'even things out,' in a very unfair society."

Doris finds herself in support of strong planning when it comes to change. She explains that"the nature of Upward Bound requires this to be so--i.e., long proposals done annually, rhetoric of 'responsibility to the citizenry'--not just a handful of parents/school board members, etc. Many details are abandoned, of course, in the actual experience. I feel that strong planning/goals/etc., allow the program itself to be characterized by more spontaneity." In actual practice, Doris adds, "the unexpected is constantly with us."

One comment made by the questionnaire, which Doris underlined, was that if teachers don't move kids in directions that meet their long range needs, or help them focus on the important rather than the less important, or help a child pursue a subject thoroughly, then we are gambling with the life-career of a child, and we become wasteful of the time, energy, and money of a lot of people. "This," Doris explains, "perhaps causes Upward Bound, in practice, to be closer to voice #1 [which favors structure] though in theory we tend to be nearer to #2 [letting be]."

Doris agrees that teachers should help a child savor

Doris Vladimiroff (con't.)

the life of the present but, she adds, "[I] know how *short-range* the goals of the 'poor' have had to be--how frustrating the present is. . ." As a result, Doris concurs with the statement that the teacher and the school are responsible to assist the child in becoming more fully aware of where he or she is going.

In discussing whether one should work for change within or outside of the system, Doris point out that for her "This is not an either-or. . .for Upward Bound must try to accomplish both--i.e., 'show the system something better' (though small by comparison) *and* whittle away at changes within the system (which is *large* and *overwhelming* and in desperate need of change)."

Doris disagrees with the notion that structures will inevitably change if change programs emphasize the individual. However, Doris writes, "I do not feel conscionable. . . about manipulating/programming individuals in order to cause 'the change' that I may feel is desirable"

For Doris, "the old 'tools of schools' (e.g., writing well, speaking effectively, thinking logically, etc.) are also 'the tools of possible change'. . .indispensable to meaningful (therefore good) change, e.g., one of the reasons to learn to communicate well is to cause change. I would refuse to sacrifice the 'academic' for the 'doing' of the open campus yet I find pathetic--demeaning and incestuous--the merely academic." Doris finally asks, "Why can't we attempt

Doris Vladimiroff (con't.)

to make the skills learned used more quickly, used more relevantly? to intertwine the excellence and the relevance?"

Peg Fisher (Teacher in the Upward Bound Program, 1970 ff.)

When planning for changes in education, Peg Fisher believes in "setting goals as a measure of self-structuring one's direction. But no goal," she adds, "is inflexible. The important question is: 'Who sets the goals?'" Upward Bound, in Peg's opinion, follows a moderately planned approach in its efforts.

Peg is usually in agreement with Upward Bound's goals and philosophies as she sees them. There is some problem, however, in what seems to be its "impersonal" style. For example, Peg sees the program as emphasizing the modification of the participant's behavior rather than trying to reach the inner person, which Peg would rather see accomplished. Also, Peg believes that Upward Bound places "getting ahead" too highly in its list of priorities for the students who take part in the program. She would rather see Upward Bound make an effort to help the students to come to grips with the present.

As to whether educational change programs should deal with a child's cultural and emotional attachments or simply emphasize the intellectual achievement, Peg suggests that "It is as elitist to downgrade intellectual achievement as it is to prefer it. For some kids, it's their only avenue of success."

Peg's discussion of structure as opposed to a free-wheeling kind of "do-what-you-want-to-do" approach to education provides an interesting insight to both her own views and how

Peg Fisher (con't.)

she perceives Upward Bound: ". . .the voices are too opposite for me, " Peg explains. "Many times kids need 'all kinds of space'--but there are times, equally as critical, when they need a *push*. My Upward Bound-Headstart experiences have led me to believe when 'moorings' are completely cut, anxiety follows. Anxiety obstructs learning. (I believe anxiety is creative for very limited periods of time--then it is debilitating)." As far as Upward Bound itself is concerned, Peg observes that the program "has been 'experimental' every year, therefore somewhat schizophrenic (i.e., we try a little of both voices). This schizophrenia often produces anxiety in both teachers and students. I fall to whatever side [more structure or 'letting be'] seems to produce the least anxiety in each student, regardless of what I'm 'supposed' to be doing."

Lea Watson (Teacher at Collins Brook School, 1970-73)

If one believes Lea Watson, then Collins Brook School is a paradox. It changes swiftly yet gradually. Strong but moderate plans are made. It builds a new structure yet works within the existing one. The leadership is closed yet open. CBS seems to be a pot pourri of all the ideas about and approaches to change that ever existed.

Lea herself believes in gradual change. She suggests "frequent reviewing of goals" and maintains that "compromises are necessary." In practice, however, Lea favors neither voice. "Philosophically, I agree with voice #2 (the gradual approach). Practically, impatience should not be avoided, it can't be, but looked at. A small compromise in method might be indicated." Lea sees CBS as closer to neither approach, but instead a combination of the two. "The fact that CBS was started outside the public system and given that it is very different from the system, suggest that the views of the program are closer to voice #1 (the swift approach). However, I feel that it was that kind of feeling which might have gotten it started, but its perpetuation and its internal progress and success is due to an attitude, of those involved daily, which is closer to voice #2 (the gradual approach).

As far as planning is concerned, Lea sees herself and CBS as following a "mixture" of the strong and moderate approaches. She distinguished between the long and the short term, indicating that long run planning is moderate, but short term plans are strong.

Neither voice fits Lea in deciding how structured a

Lea Watson (con't)

child's program should be. "My personality plays a part in the direction I would or would not show a child. If a child was turned on to something I was, chances are we'd go further. Part of my job was finding 'teachers' for kids who could really turn them on because of their own interest."

Lea favors working within the present structure as opposed to forming a new system. She sees CBS as following, once again, a combined approach. "The overall practice is a sum of its parts, i.e., teachers. Therefore, the first and second voices reflect the overall practice of the program."

Both individual and structural changes, in Lea's opinion, are evident at CBS. "The structure was different, not traditional, but within that structure the individual--his talents, responsibilities, and opportunities--were strongly emphasized."

In the question of whether the school should strive for understanding with the community or simply resign itself to the "pursuit of scholarly excellence", neither voice appeals to Lea. "A strong effort should be made to not get alienated from the community. But a lot of effort at 'fighting city hall' or helping people to understand what you are doing can take energy that might better be spent on the children, maybe helping them to realize the extent of people's differences."

Finally, because we "can't always be one or the other", Lea sees herself and CBS as exhibiting both the open and "Lion/Fox" styles of leadership which the questionnaire describes.

Ann Riley (Member of Brunswick School Board, 1964-68; Chairman, 1968-70)

Ann Riley favors swift change, strongly planned for, directed more toward the individual than toward structure. She prefers not to tamper lightly with traditional practices and advocates working within the existing system. She holds the view that school is a place where one learns to think and develop one's mind. Ann believes that school should teach a child to savor the present and she thinks that Jordan Acres also holds that view. In practice, however, she believes that both she and Jordan Acres emphasize the future and the need to get to the next higher grade. This concern for reaching upward, though Ann does not directly say it, probably reflects parents' views as a part of the educational realities in Brunswick.

Don Weafer (Teacher in Jordan Acres School, Brunswick, 1972 ff.)

In over half of his responses to the questions, Don indicates that he is not able to work his views out in actual practice. He would rather see change come about swiftly, but if forced to make changes only gradually. Don feels that he is always ready to throw out traditional practice, but in the end he must not tamper lightly with existing techniques. Don is more for "letting be" and showing a child a variety of opportunities, but in practice he has to show a concern for structure in programs. He would rather help a child appreciate the present, but instead finds himself emphasizing the importance of reaching some future goal, such as getting to the next higher grade. Don wants to work for a rapport between the community and the school but his greatest efforts go toward a child's scholarly achievement. Don would prefer the school to act as an agent for change, but instead he promotes its role in preparing the children for future citizenship. And finally, Don wants to teach all children equally, but inevitably he has to face the reality of teaching only the few, with the slim hope that the others might learn something, too.

Mary Brewer (Teacher and team leader, Jordan Acres School, Brunswick, 1972 ff.)

There's a lot of agreement between Mary Brewer's views and practices on the one hand and those which she believes to be Jordan Acres's on the other. Gradual change with moderate planning and within the system--but still being ready to swap traditional practices for new ones--seems to be an apt description of Mary's approach to educational change. She would also emphasize changes in the individual over changes in structure. In addition, Mary feels that she is close to the ideal of "teaching equally", but still, she writes, "I've got a long way to go."

The greatest difference between Mary and her perceptions of Jordan Acres is seen in the question on leadership. Mary believes in the open style and feels that she is able to practice it reasonably well. Jordan Acres, however, is seen by Mary as closer to the "Lion/Fox" style, in both view and practice. "So much more could be achieved," Mary advises, "by working *with* someone rather than *for* someone."

In the final analysis, Mary feels that "a big step is for a person to recognize that the need [for change] exists. Any changes in attitudes or methods originate from within; they can't be imposed from without."

Richard Crosman (Principal, Jordan Acres School, Brunswick,
1972-74)

Dick answered only the first six questions and did not record any responses on the remaining seven. Nonetheless, one is able to get a clear picture of Dick despite his having answered only part of the questionnaire. What is most striking is that Dick sees no incongruities between his own views and practices and his perception of those of the change program at Jordan Acres. In addition, he sees no differences between his views and his own actual practice.

If we are to take the questionnaire seriously, Dick is a man who is able to carry out his views in actual practice and who must feel secure and comfortable in his job. From the several answers which Dick does give, one gets the picture of a moderate man following the middle course: he endorses gradual change with moderate planning, expresses a concern for structure, and exhibits a willingness to make some room for the new.

Erwin Gallagher (Superintendent, Brunswick School System, 1970-74)

There were no inconsistencies in Brunswick School superintendent Erwin Gallagher's answers to the questionnaire. He felt that his own views and practices were the same in every case as the views and practices of the change program in the Brunswick elementary system, Jordan Acres. He also felt that he was able to practice his own views in each of the twelve questions which he answered. He made no response on the question dealing with the role of the school as social change agent versus its role as preparer of future citizens.

Gallagher is in favor of a gradual approach to change with a strong set of plans. He prefers not to change lightly and does not hold the view that one should always be ready to make room for the new. And he prefers to work for change within the existing structures if and when he feels change is desirable.

Gallagher also favors change in individuals over changes in structure, the school's commitment to raising community consciousness over its commitment to scholarly excellence, and an open style of leadership over over the "Lion/Fox" type articulated in the questionnaire. Gallagher's responses picture him as a moderate man who may often have to "straddle the fence."

Barbara Kurz (Elementary Supervisor, Brunswick Schools, 1970 ff.)

Barbara's views and practices in regard to educational change and those of the Jordan Acres School as she sees them are alike in her responses to seven of the questions. Barbara believes that she shares with Jordan Acres a gradual approach to change, with moderate planning, but being ready to "throw the rascals out" when necessary. She sees herself and Jordan Acres as emphasizing the inner person over outer changes in behavior, the mind over the heart, establishing new structure over working for changes within existing structure, and the school's role as preparer of future good citizens over its role of social change agent.

Perhaps more important indications of Barbara's approach to change in education can be found in her responses to the remaining questions, where her own views differ from the way she perceives Jordan Acres. The distinction which she sees between her views and her actual practice serves to highlight the differences.

Barbara is concerned more with "variety of opportunity" and "letting be" than with "structure and focus." But in actual practice, i.e. in carrying out the day to day responsibilities of her job, she must concern herself more with structure and focus, recognizing the realities of the Jordan Acres situation. This same analysis holds true in regard to emphasizing the present in a child's life as opposed to helping him or her reach a future goal (e.g., the next higher grade), individual over structural changes, community consciousness over scholarly excellence, and teaching the many equally over teaching only the few, with the many getting what they can. In each case, the former are what Barbara would like to be doing, the latter are what she actually does.

Where Barbara and her perception of Jordan Acres' fundamentally agree, it seems, is with respect to abstract approaches to educational change in general (e.g., that it should be gradual, moderately planned, and emphasize new structures rather than working within the present ones). Where Barbara's own views differ with her perceptions of Jordan Acres is in actual work with the child (e.g., in emphasizing the 'now' in a child's life, his or her sense of community, and teaching the many equally). These are the ideals with which Barbara concurs, but which are in her opinion (at least at the time she responded to the questionnaire) beyond the capabilities of the Jordan Acres School.

APPENDIX B

LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED

(The description of their role or relation to the school system is the one they had during the time span under review by the research project, 1970-1975. In the case of name changes since then, the name appears as used by the person at the time of the interview).

Rayle Ainsworth	Brunswick teacher, Jordan Acres
Terry Albert	Upward Bound student
Audrey R. Alexander	Brunswick High School teacher, formerly member of Brunswick School Board, and prior to that Principal of Brunswick Coffin Elementary School
Lee Arris	Freeport High School student, and Bowdoin student
Kirk R. Barnes	Brunswick School Board
Daniel W. Beal	Upward Bound student; Bowdoin student
Betsey Battis	Freeport teacher, Kindergarten
Roger Begin	Upward Bound student
Janice Bennett	Freeport citizen
William S. Bennett	Freeport School Board
Al Beaudoin	Principal, Middle School, Freeport
Corliss A. Blake	Freeport citizen/parent
Rachel E. Blake	Freeport citizen/parent/member of Freeport Education Development Committee
Diane Black	Brunswick, Special Education Teacher
William H. Blood	Freeport School Board
Evelyn Bryant	Brunswick Teachers' Aide, Jordan Acres
Daisy Bond	Brunswick, Clerk at Jordan Acres
Robert Bourgault	Maine Teachers Association negotiator
Betsey Bowen	Brunswick teacher, Jordan Acres
Ellen Bowman-Neilly	Brunswick teacher, Longfellow School
Mary E. Brewer	Brunswick teacher, Jordan Acres
Bonnie Bell Bustard	Upward Bound student
Brownie Carson	Upward Bound teacher
Robert Cartmill	Superintendent, Freeport Schools
Michael Chapko	Bowdoin Faculty/Upward Bound teacher

Marilyn Chase	Brunswick speech therapist
Philip Chase, Jr.	Freeport Middle School teacher
Nancy R. Clark	Brunswick High School teacher, President Maine Teachers Association
John N. Cole	Brunswick citizen/Editor, Maine Times
Elissa Congor	Collins Brook School staff
Ernest Cotton	Upward Bound student
Herbert R. Coursen	Bowdoin Faculty/Upward Bound teacher
Kay F. Covell	Brunswick teacher, Jordan Acres
Sarah Cox	Collins Brook School pupil
Richard Crosman	Principal, Brunswick Jordan Acres Elementary School
Reny Demers	Principal, Brunswick Longfellow Elementary School
Marianne Deschaines	Upward Bound student
Carol Dolloff	Brunswick citizen,parent; Collins Brook School, parent
Susan Dolloff	Collins Brook School, pupil
Helen Doyle	Brunswick teacher, Jordan Acres
Kathy Duffy	Upward Bound student
Steph Duplessis	Upward Bound, Assistant to the Director
Phyllis Estes	Freeport School Board member
Linda Ewing	Upward Bound student
Henry L. Favreau	Brunswick School Board member
Vera Field	Brunswick teacher, Longfellow School
Merton D. (Bud) Fillmore	Freeport School Board, Chairman
Gordon Finnemore	Upward Bound student
Peg Fisher	Freeport citizen/parent-Upward Bound,teache
Ray Fisher	Freeport citizen/parent-Upward Bound teacher

Robin Flagg	Upward Bound student
Joyce Friedman	Collins Brook School, Administrative Assistant/teacher
Joyce A. Freeman	Brunswick teacher, Jordan Acres
Alfred H. Fuchs	Bowdoin faculty, Upward Bound teacher, Chairman, Upward Bound Advisory Committee
Janet R. Galle	Brunswick citizen/member of planning committees Jordan Acres School
Frank Garland	Freeport School Board member
Sue Gervais	Upward Bound student
Roger Gilbert	Collins Brook School, teacher
Jack Glatter	Upward Bound teacher
Bryan Gottlieb	Freeport citizen/parent (Collins Brook School and Freeport Schools)
Martha Gottlieb	Freeport citizen/parent (Collins Brook School and Freeport Schools)
A. L. (Roy) Greason	Bowdoin, Dean of the College, Chairman, Brunswick School Committee
Peter Grua	Bowdoin student, volunteer aide, Brunswick Jordan Acres
Ruth Gruninger	Freeport teacher, Soule Elementary School
Mary Haggerty	Brunswick teacher, Jordan Acres
H. Harry Harrington	Upward Bound teacher
Ruth Harris	Collins Brook School, staff
Paul Hazelton	Bowdoin faculty, Chairman, Advisory Committee on Upward Bound
Priscilla Hinckley	Upward Bound student
Bridget Healy	Freeport School Board member
James L. Hodge	Bowdoin faculty, Upward Bound teacher, Chairman Upward Bound Advisory Committee
Joyce Hopkins	Principal, Freeport Soule Elementary School
Helen Horowitz	Brunswick teacher, Jordan Acres

Charlotte Howard	Upward Bound, Assistant to the Director
Paul Hurlburt	Principal, Brunswick Middle School
Patricia Hutchinson	Brunswick teacher, Jordan Acres
Mildred Jones	Freeport teacher, Kindergarten
Rick Karg	Collins Brook School teacher
Marcia Keith	Freeport Elementary Supervisor
Jamie Kellem	Collins Brook School teacher
Barbara D. Kurz	Brunswick Elementary Supervisor
Anne Ladley	Collins Brook School/parent
John B. Ladley	Collins Brook School/parent
Sam Ladley	Collins Brook School/pupil
Lisa La Joie	Freeport High School/student
Marilyn La Joie	Freeport citizen/parent
Donna LaPierre	Brunswick teacher, Jordan Acres
Ed Lee	Upward Bound teacher/Project research assistant
Dan Levine	Bowdoin faculty, Upward Bound teacher, Chairman, Upward Bound Advisory Committee
Richard Lord	Brunswick citizen
Dorothy MacKenzie	Brunswick teacher, Jordan Acres
Cynthia R. McLaughlin	Freeport High School teacher
Mary Grace Mellow	Upward Bound student
Halton Merrill	Freeport, President of Freeport Teachers Association, Principal of the Middle School
Alan E. Miller	Brunswick citizen, parent, Upward Bound teacher
Marcella Morin	Upward Bound student
Pat Morrison	Freeport School Board member

Shirley Nichols	Freeport School Board member
Clement A. Nickerson	Brunswick citizen, member of planning committees for Jordan Acres School
Ruth Noyes	Freeport citizen, parent, reporter for Portland Press Herald
Robert Nunn	Bowdoin faculty, Upward Bound teacher
Jean O'Brien	Freeport School Board member
Jana O'Brien	Freeport teacher, Soule Elementary School
Jerry Oleson	Freeport High School teacher
Earl L. Ormsby	Brunswick School Board member
Shannon Palmer	Upward Bound student
Connie Pennington	Collins Brook School teacher
Vida Peskay	Brunswick, teaching consultant
Joe Polsner	Freeport teacher, Middle School
Marion F. (Pic) Pettit	Freeport School Board, Chairman
Josh Praver	Collins Brook School student
Hubert E. Redding	Freeport School Board member, Acting Superintendent
Carla Rensenbrink	Freeport teacher, Morse Street Elementary
Trink, Greta, Lizzie Rensenbrink	Collins Brook School, pupils
Debbie Ries	Bowdoin student, Jordan Acres volunteer aide
Shirley Roper	Upward Bound student
Judy Roulliard	Brunswick teachers' aide, Jordan Acres
Stephen D. Reid	Upward Bound, Assistant Director
Ann Riley	Brunswick School Board, Chairman
Philmore Ross	Brunswick School Board, Chairman
Douglas Schooler	Freeport, School Counsellor
Anne Schwenk	Freeport citizen, parent; Collins Brook School, parent

Herman Schwenk	Freeport citizen, parent; Collins Brook School, parent
Alfred Senter	Brunswick citizen
Carol Shaw	Brunswick teacher, Jordan Acres
Dorothy G. Shea	Brunswick teacher, Jordan Acres
Jim Shepperd	Collins Brook School, business manager
Lisa Shepperd	Collins Brook School, student
Mim Shepperd	Freeport teacher, Soule Elementary School
Alison Shipman	Brunswick, librarian Jordan Acres
Helen Small	Brunswick teacher, Longfellow School
Linda Smith	Collins Brook School teacher
Ron Snyder	Brunswick, Acting Superintendent
Reed Stanley	Upward Bound student
Ernie Stallworth	Reporter, Bath-Brunswick Times Record
Nora Thompson	Brunswick teacher, Jordan Acres
Joseph Threadgill	Upward Bound teacher
Mary Timmerman	Brunswick teacher, Jordan Acres
Andy VanSickle	Collins Brook School student
Sally Vogel	Freeport Elementary Reading Program, Director
Doris Vladimiroff	Upward Bound, Director
Dick Watson	Collins Brook School, Director
Lea Watson	Collins Brook School, teacher
Sharon Watson	Collins Brook School, co-Director
Donald F. Weafer, Jr.	Brunswick teacher, Jordan Acres
Bud Wellington	Collins Brook School, teacher
Marion M. White	Freeport Middle School, librarian
Susan White	Collins Brook School, teacher
Margaret C. Whitehouse	Freeport teachers' aide, Soule Elementary School

Judith A. Whitman	Brunswick teacher, Jordan Acres
Tom Wills	Collins Brook School, staff member
Gladys S. Wilson	Principal, Brunswick Union Street Elementary School; member, planning committee, Jordan Acres School
Evelyn Wyman	Brunswick teacher, Jordan Acres

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Althusser, Louis, "Marx's Immense Theoretical Revolution" in The Structuralists from Marx to Levi-Strauss, edited by Richard and Fernando LeGeorge, Anchor Books, 1972.

Barber, James David, The Lawmakers: Recruitment and Adaptation to Legislative Life, New Haven, 1965.
Barber, James David, The Presidential Character: Predicting Performance in The White House, Prentice Hall, 1972.
Beer, Samuel H., British Politics in the Collectivist Age, New York, Knopf, 1966.
Borton, Terry, Reach, Touch, and Teach: Student Concerns and Process Education, McGraw Hill, 1970.
Brickhout, Robert, et. al., Toward Social Change: A Handbook for Those Who Will, Harper & Row, 1971.
Bruyn, Severyn T., The Human Perspective in Sociology: The Methodology of Participant Observation, Prentice Hall, 1966.

Clark, David L., and Guba, Egon G., An Examination of Potential Change Roles in Education, N E A, Washington, D. C. Center for the Study of Instruction, 1965
Cronbach, L. J. and Suppes, P., eds., Research for Tomorrow's Schools, Disciplined Inquiry for Education, Macmillan, 1969.
Crozier, Michel, The Bureaucratic Phenomenon, Chicago, 1964.
Crozier, Michel, The Stalled Society, Viking Press, 1973.
Chin, R., "Basic Strategies and Procedures in Effecting Change," Designing Education for the Future No. 3: Planning and Effecting Needed Change in Education, Morphet, E. L., and Ryan, C. O., eds., New York, 1967.

Dennison, George, The Lives of Children, Vintage, 1969.
Dewey, John, and Bentley, Arthur F., Knowing and the Known, Beacon Press, 1949.
Dounton, James V., Jr., Rebel Leadership, Commitment and Charisma in the Revolutionary Process, Free Press, 1973.

Eisinstadt, S. N., Tradition, Change, and Modernity, Wiley-Interscience, New York, 1973.
Erikson, Erik, Childhood and Society, New York: W. W. Norton, 1963.

Fanon, Frantz, The Wretched of the Earth, Pref. by Jean Paul Satre , Translated from the French by Constance Farrington, New York, Grove Press, 1966.
Featherstone, Joseph, "The Primary School Revolution in Britain," New Republic, Aug 10, 1967; Sept. 2, 1967; Sept. 9, 1967.
Freire, Paulo, Pedagogy of The Oppressed, translated by Myra Bergman Ramos, Herder and Herder, 1968.

Glasser, Wm., Schools Without Failure, New York, 1969.

Halpern, Manfred, Politics of Social Change in the Middle East and North Africa, Rand Corporation, 1963.
Halpern, Manfred, "A Re-definition of the Revolutionary Situation," in National Liberation, Norman Miller and Roderick Aya, eds., Free Press, 1971.
Havelock, Ronald G., Knowledge Utilization and Dissemination, a Bibliography, Institute for Social Research, U. of Michigan, 1972.
Herndon, James, How to Survive in Your Native Land, Bantam, 1971.
Holt, John, How Children Fail, Pitman, 1964.
Holt, John, How Children Learn, Pitman, 1967.
Harris, Kenneth A., Scientific Explanation and Political Justification, Paper presented at the 1973 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Copyright 1973, APSA.
Hoffer, Eric, The True Believer, New York, Mentor Books, 1951.

Ilich, Ivan, Deschooling Society, Harper and Row, New York, 1971.

Jenks, Christopher, et al., Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling in America, Basic Books, 1972.

Katz, Michael, Class, Bureaucracy, and the Schools, Praeger, 1972.
Kohl, Herbert R., The Open Classroom: A Practical Guide to a New Way of Teaching, New York, 1969.
Kohler, Wolfgang, Gestalt Psychology, An Introduction to New Concepts in Modern Psychology. Liveright, 1947, paperback edition, 1970.
Kozol, Jonathan, Death at an Early Age, Bantam, 1967.
Kozol, Jonathan, Free Schools, Bantam Books, 1972.
Kuhn, T. S., The Structure of Scientific Revolutions, U. of Chicago Press, 1970.

Laing, R. D., The Politics of the Family and Other Essays, Vantage Books, 1972.
Levi-Strauss, Claude, Structural Anthropology, Doubleday Anchor, 1972.
Lowi, Theodore, The Politics of Disorder, New York, Basic Books, 1971.

Maguire, Louis M., Observations and Analysis of the Literature of Change, Research for Better Schools, Inc., Philadelphia, 1970.
McClelland, Wm. A., The Process of Effecting Change, George Washington University, Human Resources Research Office, 1968.
Merleau, Ponty M. The Structure of Behavior, Boston, 1947.
Miller, Richard I., ed., Perspectives on Educational Change, Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1967.
Morin, Edgar, Rumour in Orleans, Translated by Peter Green, Pantheon, 1971.

Neil, A. S., Summerhill, A Radical Approach to Child Rearing, New York, Hart, 1960.

Piaget, Jean, The Moral Judgment of the Child, New York, Harcourt, Brace, 1932.

Sarason, Seymour B., The Culture of The School and the Problem of Change, Allyn and Bacon, 1971.
Saxe, Richard W., Opening the Schools, Alternate Ways to Learning, Berkeley, McCutchan Publishing Company, 1972.
Schurmann, Franz, Ideology and Organization in Communist China, 2nd Ed. Berkeley, [illegible].
Silberman, Charles E., Crisis in the Classroom, New York, 1970.
Skinner, B. F., Contingencies of Reinforcement: a Theoretical Analysis. New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1969.
Skinner, B. F., Walden Two, MacMillan, 1962.
Stewart, W. A. C. and McCann, W. P., The Educational Innovators Vol. I, 1750-1880, St. Martin's Press, 1967; Vol. II, Progressive Schools, 1881-1967, St. Martin's Press, 1968.
Stodgill, Ralph M., Handbook of Leadership--A Survey of Theory and Research, Free Press, 1974.
Strong, Tracy B. The Activity of Political Science as Science, paper presented at the 1973 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Copyright, APSA.

Verba, Sidney, Small Groups and Political Behavior, A Study of Leadership, Princeton, 1961.

Weber, Max, Essays in Sociology, translated, edited, and with an introduction by H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills, O U P, 1958.